EXHIBIT 10

PART 2

193 191 1 if ALPA had hung tough, there might have been a whether seniority integration was decided in 2 2 state of the world where they could have arbitration arbitration or negotiation process where there was 3 3 on all or part of the merger of the seniority list. no right to arbitration? 4 4 But I didn't consider the form of the dispute No. A 5 5 resolution mechanism. I was considering what I 0 Not in any way? 6 6 thought of as the market realities, which had to do A The analysis I did simply asks -- it 7 asks a very simple question. It doesn't take into 7 with viability and -- and value. 8 8 BY MR. TOAL: account the particulars of the dispute settlement 9 Now you -- you discussed in your 9 mechanism. It simply looks at comparable situations 10 and asks, what happened in comparable situations? 10 testimony the motives of arbitrators. Do you recall 11 11 that testimony? How did the pilots fare? 12 12 A Yes. Well, the comparable situations that 13 Do you believe that negotiators in a 13 you referenced, six of the seven involved arbitrated 0 results; correct? 14 situation where there is no right to arbitration 14 15 A Yes, uh-huh. 15 share the same motivations that arbitrators possess? 16 Q And do you know the one negotiated 16 No. Even when -- even when there is 17 resolution, whether that was something that was 17 arbitration, the negotiators don't share the 18 negotiated where there was a right to arbitration in 18 objectives of the arbitrators. What I'm simply 19 the absence of agreement? 19 saying is, what arbitrators do to pursue their own 20 A I don't know that sitting here. 20 goals is effectively to give the negotiators 21 something they can both live with. Because if they 21 Q And I thought you testified previously 22 can't give them what they can both live with, they 22 that you would not expect a negotiation where there was no right to arbitration to yield the same sorts 23 are going to get a reputation as being unfair to one 23 of results as an arbitration process itself or a 24 side or the other and they are not going to get 24 25 called back. And what I'm saying is, negotiators, 25 negotiation where there -- there was a right to 192 194 1 arbitration? 1 when they negotiate an agreement, negotiate 2 2 something they can both live with. That's the MR. PRESS: I object to the form of the 3 3 question. I think he said just the opposite, but go essence of reaching agreement through negotiation. 4 4 If they can reach an agreement; ahead. Q 5 THE WITNESS: I expanded that a little 5 correct? 6 6 bit later to explain how there wasn't the tight Yes A 7 7 theoretical relationship that I described early on And there are many instances in which Q 8 8 between negotiating in the presence of arbitration negotiations fail to reach agreement; correct? 9 and negotiating not. But, again, my understanding 9 Not many. Most cases -- I mean not --10 10 of the behavior of the arbitrators in general is in seniority integration, that's not -- it is true. 11 11 In many cases they fail to reach agreement, that's that what they are trying to do is do what's fair in 12 12 a particular situation, and that's -- and that correct, and that's why there is arbitration. 13 ultimately is what the parties are going to wind up, 13 So in a situation involving seniority 14 if they can reach a negotiated settlement, that's 14 integration where there is negotiation without a 15 15 right to arbitration, what -- what's your view about where the negotiated settlement's going to be. So, 16 16 what the motives of the negotiators are and whether ultimately, the marketing forces, i.e., things like 17 viability, things like the value are brought to the 17 they are similar to the motives of arbitrators? 18 You have to tell me what the -- what 18 -- to the merger, and so on are going to be the 19 19 the -- in game theoretic terms, what the threat dominant factors. 20 20 And -- so, as a result, when I looked for point is. What happens if they don't reach comparables, I wasn't saying this is comparable in 21 21 agreement? That determines negotiation. In arbitration, when there is -- when arbitration is a 22 relation to the kind of dispute resolution 22 23 mechanism. And I'm not ruling -- by the way, I'm 23 possibility, the threat point is what the arbitrator

50 (Pages 191 to 194)

In negotiation, without arbitration, in a --

24

25

is going to do.

24

not ruling out arbitration. Despite all this

testimony, I'm not ruling out the possibility that,

197 195 1 concerned about reaching what they regard as the in a standard labor setting where management and 2 right result than reaching a result that will 2 labor are negotiating, they go on strike, and then 3 they just -- it's like two fighters punching each 3 maximize their chances of getting hired for 4 subsequent arbitrations; correct? 4 other, and then they figure out who's going to win 5 5 A I -- I suppose. Those arbitrators will that fight, and that becomes kind of the focal point 6 not -- will not survive in the market for 6 of the negotiation. 7 7 In -- in the pilots' case, where the two pilot arbitrators. groups met each other, American's going to -- the 8 Q Did you undertake any effort to analyze 8 9 what the threat point was for the APA in its 9 American pilots are going to sit there and they are negotiations with the TWA MEC? 10 10 going to say, what's going to happen if we hang 11 tough? The TWA pilots are going to say, what's 11 A No. 12 Can you think of any threat point to 12 going to happen if we hang tough? And they are 13 13 the pilots that were represented by the APA in going to presumably come to some general 14 connection with this particular negotiation? 14 understanding of what that's going to mean. It 15 MR. PRESS: I want to object to the 15 might mean they don't reach agreement, and it might 16 form of the question and the use of the phrase 16 mean the deal doesn't go through. And TWA pilots, 17 17 threat point. in order to hold tough enough in negotiation, are 18 THE WITNESS: A threat point is a 18 going -- if they think they don't want to give up, 19 technical term that an economist uses that might --19 they must think that there are other opportunities 20 have - it has to do with where -- what -- where 20 out there which will be better for them than that. 21 And, ultimately, that will govern the negotiations. 21 would they just -- if there is no agreement reached 22 with the TWA pilots. And that depends very much on 22 So I can't predict for you exactly what the 23 what ALPA and the TWA pilots are able -- are able to 23 negotiations would do. Though I think on, you know, 24 do, and how much American wants the transaction and 24 my set of comparables, on average, shows what two 25 pilots groups, you know, where they would wind up. 25 so on. And what the TWA pilots has as their next 196 198 1 1 It doesn't show what -- where two pilot best alternative. 2 2 So that there is very - many pieces to it, groups would wind up. It shows what an average 3 3 and the -- the -- the American pilots, I don't know metric is for the set of arbitrations and the one 4 4 if they ever really, without the pressure from the negotiation that you identified as comparables; 5 5 ALPA, I don't know if they ever thought through what correct? 6 6 the economists would call the extensive form gain But those are pilot groups. Those are 7 is, the gain, bargaining gain down the road which 7 two pilot groups in each case. And those 8 says, okay, what happens to us if we don't give up a 8 arbitrations and the one negotiation represent, 9 little bit here? 9 effectively, you know, roughly speaking, something 10 10 BY MR. TOAL: both sides can live with in each of those cases. Did -- well, that's what you say 11 Q What -- what pressure could the -- what 11 12 pressure could ALPA bring to bear on the American 12 arbitrators aim to do; correct? 13 Airlines pilots? 13 And that -- what they aim to do, that's 14 A I don't know. I -- they could, first 14 right, and that's what negotiators wind up doing, 15 of all, not waive -- waive the TWA pilots' right to 15 arbitration. Now you've got two groups of pilots; 16 16 But arbitrators may not succeed in 17 one of which says they are not going to arbitrate. 17 doing that; correct? 18 One of them says we had a contract that says we are 18 I suppose there are arbitrators who get Α 19 going to arbitration. I just don't know how that 19 it wrong. 20 20 works out. 0 And -- and some arbitrators may be more 21 • Any other pressure that you can think 21 concerned about reaching the result that they 22 of that ALPA could have brought to bear on the 22 consider appropriate than getting rehired for the 23 American pilots? 23 next arbitration; correct? 24 MR. PRESS: It's been asked and 24 Can you -- can you say that again? 25 answered. I object to the form. 25 Yeah. Some arbitrators may be more

51 (Pages 195 to 198)

201 199 1 previous acquisition that American Airlines went MR. TOAL: I didn't ask whether -through. What acquisition was that? The answer is, 2 2 where there was anything else. 3 3 that was the Reno acquisition. And the question is, MR. PRESS: You asked about leverage in 4 and what issues arose out of the Reno acquisition? 4 the same line, but go ahead. 5 5 THE WITNESS: Not as I sit here. And the answer is, well, we ended up in a fairly 6 6 major dispute with our pilots, and then it ended up Well, let me amend that answer, if you don't 7 7 with a work action, a legal work action, as it turns mind. 8 8 out, by our pilots where we needed to go into court BY MR. TOAL: 9 9 and have it resolved in the courts. While we Q Yeah. Go ahead. 10 prevailed legally, a number of things happened that 10 There could be a, you know, a work --11 were quite unattractive. When you have work 11 there could be a work -- a work action. You can imagine that, you know, I don't know how this would 12 disruption, obviously, it impacts your customers. 12 13 It impacts your reputation. But it also, obviously, 13 play out, but you can imagine, I don't even know if 14 even though we prevailed, had an impact on our 14 it is in the TWA pilots' interest, but it could be. 15 relationship with our pilots. Do you see that 15 American -- say the deals goes through, American 16 pilots and TWA, and now they are one airline, and testimony? 16 17 17 the TWA pilots say we are shutting down the A Yes. 18 18 Q And were you aware that American St. Louis hub until we get a seniority integration. 19 Airlines reported that, as a result of actions taken 19 And -- I'm not saying that works. I'm assuming that 20 you are asking, what other tools does a union have 20 by the American Airlines pilots due to the Reno 21 acquisition, that American Airlines disclosed 21 to put pressure on some other group? 22 prehearing losses of between 2 and \$225 million in 22 Q I was talking about before the 23 1999? 23 transaction. 24 No. After the transaction. 24 A A 25 0 Okay. So let's confine your answer to 25 0 If you had been aware of that history 202 200 involving the Reno acquisition, would that have 1 before the transaction closed. 2 Can you conceive of any additional pressure 2 affected your analysis in any way? 3 3 No. that ALPA could have brought to bear on the American A 4 4 Would it have affected your views about Airlines pilots? 5 5 American Airlines' willingness to put pressure on No. No. A 6 6 its own pilots to agree to some sort of negotiated The answer is no? Q 7 7 or arbitrated seniority integration list? A No. Except to threaten that work 8 8 \mathbf{A} Repeat the question, please. stoppage. 9 9 Yeah. Might it have affected your In advance of the transaction, how Q Q 10 views on the willingness of American Airlines to put 10 would -- how would that have threatened the American 11 pressure on its pilots to agree to a negotiated or 11 Airlines pilots? 12 It would have put pressure on American 12 an arbitrated seniority integration list? A 13 13 No. to put pressure on its pilots. A 14 Q Why not? 14 There is a third party here, which is 15 American, right, which, you know, clearly is -- is a 15 I just don't see how it would. In 16 very influential player, and I'm not -- I'm not 16 other words, I -- I don't -- from reading this 17 saying -- I've not analyzed this game. You are 17 little bit, I don't know exactly the nature of the 18 18 dispute. Apparently it was an acquisition. asking me hypotheticals about how they can put 19 pressure, and I'm simply saying that there are more 19 Apparently -- I don't know why -- these are the 20 tools than you can imagine -- than I can imagine, I 20 American pilots, not the Reno pilots, apparently, 21 21 who are engaged in a work action, and I don't know think, to do that. 22 22 Okay. So that -- below the testimony why. 0 23 we just read from Mr. Carty, who is the CEO at 23 Would it be important to your analysis 24 American Airlines, starting at line 17 on page 26, I 24 to understand why the American Airlines took this action, and what its implications would be for the 25 ask, so you mentioned a prior history, including the 25

52 (Pages 199 to 202)

205 203 1 asking about a hypothetical world that didn't occur. willingness of American Airlines to put pressure on 2 2 And the way I do that is by looking at other its pilots? 3 3 A No. situations that are comparable, and suggesting that 4 those are good models for what would have gone on 4 Q Would any -- would a review of any 5 5 but for the -- the -- the negligent behavior of testimony in this case be relevant to your analysis 6 ALPA. 6 in any way? 7 7 BY MR. TOAL: A I don't know what all the testimony in 8 8 this case is. So is your testimony now that the other 9 9 testimony that's been offered in this case might Well, testimony from the TWA's -- TWA's 10 CEO and CFO, for instance, would that be relevant to have been relevant to your analysis, you would need 10 to review it to determine if it was or not? 11 your analysis in any way? 11 12 12 What I'm suggesting is that it is hard Testimony about what? 13 13 for me, as I sit here, to think of testimony that Q Well, testimony about any -- any number 14 would be relevant. But for me to categorically rule 14 of things. But is -- is there any potential that 15 out that anything anyone might say would be 15 their testimony in this case would be relevant to 16 irrelevant would, you know, be foolish. 16 your analysis? Do you have any plans to review the 17 17 Not that sit -- not that I can sit A 18 testimony that's been offered in this case? 18 here, no. 19 I have no current plan to do that. 19 0 And testimony from representatives at 20 20 Paragraph 24 of your report at page the APA, would that be relevant to your analysis in 0 21 21 any way? nine. 22 My report. Hold on. I have to dig it 22 Α A No. 23 23 Q Testimony from the former CEO of out here. Okay. 24 American Airlines, could that have been relevant to 24 You said in the third sentence, second, 25 your analysis in any way? 25 arbitrators are motivated to provide a merged 206 204 1 seniority list that meets the needs of both groups 1 I would have to see -- actually, I'm 2 not -- I'm not happy with this whole line of 2 of pilots in a fair and equitable way. Do you see 3 that? 3 questions. You are asking me about testimony that I 4 4 haven't seen and asking me is it -- is it relevant. A Yes. 5 5 And what did you mean by a list that I would have to see all the testimony and then Q 6 meets the needs of both groups? 6 decide whether it's relevant. 7 7 What I mean is that a -- a -- a merged I didn't ask you if it was relevant. I 8 asked you if it might have been relevant to your 8 seniority list that both groups of pilots can live 9 9 with. analysis, and you said no. 10 10 And do you have any empirical support MR. PRESS: And the witness is 11 11 for that statement? uncomfortable. 12 THE WITNESS: I'm uncomfortable. 12 A Yes. 13 MR. PRESS: And understandably because 13 0 What is it? 14 I mean, it is not about seniority 14 you are asking him to speculate about unknown 15 15 lists. It is about the motivation of arbitrators, testimony. 16 THE WITNESS: I -- I -- the 16 if that's what you want to hear about. 17 question is so broad. I probably should not have 17 Whatever you think your empirical 18 18 support for that statement is. answered the way I did a few questions ago, just 19 saying no, no, no without knowing what the testimony 19 Right. For example, empirical support 20 could possibly be about. The kind of -- the 20 -- I believe there is a paper that -- an academic 21 21 paper we included in our backup by Bloom & Cavanaugh statements you've shown me here, I'm saying wouldn't 22 22 which, if I recall the paper, is about -- it is -affect what I did, which, again, is all about saying 23 23 it is about arbitration of public sector labor how does - how do I as an expert economist, how do 24 I figure -- how do I make some estimate of what 24 disputes. And there is a panel of arbitrators. And 25 25 would have happened absent a behavior, which is when the parties can't agree, a list of arbitrators,

53 (Pages 203 to 206)

209 207 the state -- the state labor relations board, this 1 transactions in my -- I don't include transactions is in New Jersey, sends a list of, I think, five 2 in my analysis based on how they came out. I 3 names or seven names. I don't remember the exact 3 include transactions in my analysis based on 4 number, to each side, a list of names of 4 availability of information. 5 5 So if you had the available arbitrators. And each side gets to strike two names and rank the remaining four, or something, or make 6 information, would you include that --7 strike three -- two whatever, two -- strike a few 7 I would use the past tense. Had I had 8 names and rank the rest. 8 the information on American/Reno that allowed me to 9 9 determine about viability, and value, and I was able And the -- the interesting feature of this 10 list, of the ranking, then they have data on how, 10 to compute, based on the information available, the 11 across a wide variety of labor disputes, the 11 mean rank difference, I would have included it in my 12 rankings, whether the rankings -- how the rankings 12 analysis, whatever it showed. 13 look two from the two sides, labor and management 13 And if a -- if the pilots of one 14 rankings. If arbitrators are motivated to, you 14 airline were stapled to the bottom of the list, what 15 know -- and then you can build a model which says if 15 would the promotional difference in mean ranks be? 16 a arbitrator wants to get rehired, he needs to get 16 Well, that -- that depends on whether 17 highly ranked on the list, on both lists. 17 they were all stapled or just some of them. It 18 And, indeed, the rankings of arbitrators tend 18 depends on -- it depends on the relative size of the 19 to be positively correlated, meaning arbitrators 19 two groups. 20 that tend to get ranked highly by labor, also tend 20 Q And if they were all stapled, what 21 21 would the proportional difference in mean ranks be? to get ranked highly by management. And the way you 22 22 do that is by providing awards in cases that both Well, one of our -- one of our examples 23 sides perceive as fair and equitable, and that they 23 in the -- in the text of my report -- let me refer 24 can live with. And if they don't do that, they get 24 you to the right paragraph. 25 25 rated poorly and they don't get selected. Can you answer the question without 208 210 1 So is your empirical support for that 1 referring to your report? 2 2 Well, it would just make the answer statement based on a study of which arbitrators get 3 3 clearer for you, I think. If you look at paragraph struck in -- in union disputes? 4 4 It is based on the study of the fact 45 on page 15, if the airlines were the same size 5 that unions and -- labor and management tend to 5 and you stapled one group to the bottom, you would 6 6 get a proportional rank difference of minus .1. strike the same arbitrators or -- or rank highly the 7 7 Paragraph 27 of your report on page 10, same arbitrators. 8 8 you say, arbitrators commonly consider a number of O Other than that article, do you have 9 any other empirical support for that statement? 9 factors. One constant is that they attempt to 10 10 No. Not of the -- I can look, but preserve the pre-transaction relative ranks of the 11 right now, that's what I recall. pilots on the pre-transaction seniority list. 11 12 Did you make any efforts to discover Uh-huh. 12 A 13 13 what the seniority integration of the Reno/American Q Do you see that? 14 Air pilots was? 14 Yes. A 15 And did you review Supplement CC to see 15 I have not seen anything on that case, A Q whether it maintained the relative pre-transaction 16 16 no. 17 Then did you make any efforts to --17 ranks of pilots from each group? 18 Not explicitly, no. 18 efforts to find out how those pilots were A 19 19 Okay. Do you have any reason to integrated? 0 20 20 believe that that list did not maintain --A No. 21 And if you were to determine that the 21 No. I expect that it did, but I did 22 Reno pilots were stapled to the bottom of the 22 not review it with that in mind. 23 seniority list, would you include that transaction 23 In paragraph 32 of your report, on the 24 24 following page, page 11, you say, in addition to in your analysis? 25 Remember, I only can conclude 25 preserving pre-transaction relative ranks,

54 (Pages 207 to 210)

211 213 1 Do you think that more expansive arbitrators generally tend to preserve the career 2 expectations of both groups of pilots. Such 2 treatment would have had greater accuracy, provided 3 expectations include (A) likelihood of promotion on 3 that you had the data that you discussed? 4 one hand and (B) likelihood of furlough on the 4 Greater accuracy? I'm not sure what 5 other. Do you see that? 5 you mean by that. 6 6 Well, you acknowledged that arbitrators A Yes. 7 Q Did you make any attempt to analyze the 7 take into account numerous factors; right? seniority integration of American Airlines and TWA 8 8 It would reduce the amount of -- how do 9 9 I want to say -- what we call the estimation error using those factors? 10 My view was that the -- the questions 10 or the sampling error. So, in other words, I have 11 of value and -- and -- and continued flying 11 this kind of bounds I give you that while I don't 12 12 incorporated a lot of that when the list is used in quantify the probabilities associated with the 13 13 combination with -- with status and equipment bounds, I have an upper bound and a lower bound, in 14 factors. So while I did not consider that directly, 14 essence, with many more, I could be more -- I could 15 that's implicitly taken care of in my analysis. 15 be more quantitatively precise and have narrower 16 And just so the record is clear, did 16 bounds on what would have happened in this case. 17 17 you make any effort to analyze those questions So, in other words, I -- I would be able to pin down 18 directly? 18 more precisely what happened. What I have done is 19 \mathbf{A} 19 -- is, essentially, the best estimate I can come up 20 20 Q And is there a reason that you didn't? with given the data I have available. 21 Well, they -- they are very hard to 21 But your estimate doesn't take into A 22 measure. I didn't have data in a lot -- in a lot of 22 account at all the premerger expectations of the 23 cases that would enable me to come up with -- it is 23 American Airlines pilots and the premerger 24 expectations of the TWA pilots; correct? 24 very difficult to think of a single measure of that 25 that would make sense. So, you know, the -- it was 25 Incorrect. 212 214 sort of -- the lack of a coherent analytical plan to 1 Well, you -- you testified earlier 1 2 that, because you are using a sample of transactions 2 do that. that you think are comparable, that you have 3 3 Well, why would we need a single Q 4 4 indirectly taken into account premerger expectations measure of a multifactorial process? 5 5 Because we only have a limited number of the pilots of the acquired and the acquiring 6 airline; correct? 6 of observations. We don't observe 6,000 arbitration 7 7 A Yes. combinations of lists, mergers of lists that we can 8 8 But none of those transactions involved use to isolate the marginal effect of 30 different 9 9 a transaction between American Airlines and TWA as factors. We only have a handful, so we have to do 10 10 of January of 2001; correct? this -- you know, we have to -- we have to make 11 analytic choices that we think capture the important 11 A They were from different arbitrations 12 -- different mergers. 12 parts of what's going on. This is the nature of --13 Right. So I'm asking whether your 13 of doing this kind of -- you know, basically data Q 14 driven statistical work with limited numbers of 14 analysis took into account the specific career 15 expectations of pilots from American Airlines as of 15 trials. January 2001 and pilots of TWA as of January 2001? 16 16 If you had had more data points, would 17 17 The answer is yes, it did. you have tried to take additional factors into A 18 18 0 How did it do that? account? 19 It did that indirectly through the use 19 I think if I had 3,000 mergers of 20 20 of comparable cases. In those other cases, the seniority lists and I had coherent data that I could 21 21 pilots in both groups had career expectations. extract from them that was comparable across the 22 3,000 mergers. Imagine we had a law that said you 22 Those career expectations are -- are related to the 23 23 have to fill out a particular form every time you do financial viability and value, and they are 24 24 a merger, and that I had access to those forms, I reflected in the arbitration awards. 25 But those are different airlines with could do something more expansive, sure.

55 (Pages 211 to 214)

217 215 And wouldn't, in determining seniority 1 1 different equipment, different hiring patterns; 2 integration, wouldn't it be appropriate to take into 2 correct? 3 account the financial condition, not only of the 3 A Yes. 4 acquired airline, but the acquiring airline? 4 Q So I'm asking, with respect to the 5 A Yes. And it's assumed -- I mean, 5 particular group of pilots who were at American 6 implicit in the analysis is the assumption that the 6 Airlines in January of 2001 and the particular group 7 acquiring airline is going to continue operating. 7 of pilots who are at TWA in January 2001, does your 8 The combined airline is going to continue operating, analysis do anything to take into account their 9 or even the -- the acquiring airline, absent the 9 specific career expectations? 10 merger, would continue to operate. I don't think I 10 MR. PRESS: I object. This is the 11 have any mergers in my list of comparables where the 11 third time you've asked it. 12 merger is of two dying airlines which would have 12 THE WITNESS: I've already answered ceased operation the next day had they not combined 13 13 that question. The -- the fact that -- the fact 14 and become one healthy airline. 14 that none of my other arbitrations involve planes or 15 But don't you, as an economist, have 15 pilots from TWA or American. They are all about 16 the ability to assess the financial condition of 16 other airlines. That's how you have to do this. There is only one merger between TWA and 17 acquiring or acquired airlines based on any criteria 17 other than whether -- whether it was expected to 18 18 American. In that merger, the result is tainted 19 stop flying? 19 because of ALPA's failure of their duty -- duty --20 Remember, the only financial criteria I 20 failure of their duty of fair representation. I 21 used is that I expect the airline to continue flying 21 can't use those -- the outcome of that merger to 22 or not. Those -- that's the break I use. I 22 tell me anything. I have to use the outcome of 23 don't -- you know, the airline -- well, actually, I 23 these other mergers, and that's what I do. So I've 24 say, is the airline in financial distress? There 24 taken it into account in that way. 25 are a few mergers, I think, where both airlines are 25 Could you have looked at estimated 218 216 1 quite healthy. There are mergers where one airline 1 career progressions for American Airline pilots in the absence of the merger, and with -- with the 2 2 is in financial distress but expected to continue 3 flying. But in terms of my analysis, to find my 3 transaction, and compared the two? 4 list of comparables, I just need to know, is the That's quite speculative. Arbitrators 4 5 acquiring airline in some financial fiscal distress 5 try to do that some in their reports. You're --6 but ready to keep flying. 6 I -- I think what you are asking me -- well, I'm not 7 My -- my question was whether you have 7 going to tell you what you are asking me. Could I have done -- could I have done that? I don't know. 8 the ability as an economist to determine the 8 9 financial condition of either an acquiring or 9 Q And I think you testified that that's 10 acquired airline using any criteria other than 10 what you see arbitrators trying to do in certain 11 whether it was expected to stop flying in the near 11 cases; correct? 12 future? 12 Arbitrators talk a lot about career Α 13 MR. PRESS: The question's been asked 13 expectations, and it is fairly vague. What they 14 and answered. 14 will say is, airline B is being acquired, and they 15 only have regional, tiny, little planes. Their THE WITNESS: I suppose I could do 15 16 pilots had no realistic expectation of ever flying a 16 that. 17 DC-10 across the Atlantic. Whereas, pilot --17 BY MR. TOAL: 18 O And as an economist, would you have the 18 airline A had DC-10s flying across the Atlantic, so 19 their pilots had reasonable expectations of doing 19 ability to develop a metric or several metrics to 20 that. That's why you do status and equipment 20 assess the financial condition of acquiring or 21 21 acquired airlines? breakdowns. I've not studied that question. I 22 22 0 Now, your analysis doesn't take into would have to do some work to determine whether I 23 consideration at all the financial condition of the 23 24 acquiring airline, does it? 24 could do that or not. 25 25 And in your review of arbitration

56 (Pages 215 to 218)

A

No.

221 219 1 was in some trouble. Airline C is no longer flying. decisions concerning seniority integration, did you 2 2 Those are the terms they talk in. They don't say, notice that arbitrators took into account the 3 3 the rate of return on profits for airline A was financial condition, not only of the acquired 4 4 8.6 percent last year, or their stock was up airline, but the acquiring airline? 5 5 12 percent and the other stock was only up A Yes. 6 6 8 percent. They don't use continuous measures. Q And what was the reason that you 7 7 They use categorical measures in their -- in their decided not to take into consideration in your 8 discussions. So, frankly, I'm adopting the kinds of analysis the financial condition of the acquiring 9 9 wording that the arbitrators are -- are -- are airline? 10 telling me in their -- in their reports. 10 Α Largely because we were interested in Do the categories that arbitrators use 11 what disadvantage there might be to the acquired 11 12 12 break down into flying and not flying? airline's pilots. So I was more concerned that I 13 13 not include airlines that were not flying anymore or Roughly, yeah. They roughly say, you 14 know, those guys, they are not flying anymore. 14 acquired airlines that were really strong, because 15 Their planes are all grounded, so I can't give their 15 it wouldn't -- it wouldn't be fair to say that TWA 16 pilots should have done as well as an acquired -pilots -- their career expectations are de minimis. 16 17 And, therefore, I'm not going to give them -- I'm 17 pilots from an acquired airline where that airline 18 not going to give them very favorable position on 18 was strong and not in any fiscal trouble at all. I 19 19 the merged seniority list. Or they will say, didn't see the matter to be as pressing on the 20 20 acquiring airline side because most airlines doing airline B was in trouble, but they brought a lot of 21 equipment to the merger and they had -- and they 21 acquiring are in reasonable shape. That's why they 22 were flying, and so -- while they don't deserve the 22 are out there acquiring other airlines. 23 date of the hire merger they were asking for, they 23 But there is a continuum in terms of 24 24 financial condition; correct? deserve more consideration than airline A, which is 25 Yes. Correct. But I created a very 25 acquiring them, is offering. \mathbf{A} 222 220 1 And are those the only two categories crude breakdown. I didn't use the continuum. 2 But you could have used the continuum; 2 that you saw arbitrators using to describe the 0 3 3 financial condition of acquiring airlines? correct? 4 4 Of acquiring airlines. Most of the I'm not sure how. Remember, again, I 5 5 time the acquiring airline is in good financial have this problem of what we call informally where I 6 6 condition. So I can't say it is the only two. I work, micronumerosity, meaning not very many -- not 7 7 don't remember the wording of every one. But, boy, very many observations. And to use a continuous 8 variable, I need to then have -- I need to have 8 for the most part, the acquiring airlines are doing 9 9 okay. That's why they are buying. those 3,000 mergers to look at so I can get 3,000 10 10 Did you make any effort to assess in different data points. I can break that down into three categories; healthy, not healthy but flying, 11 your list of comparables, the value of the assets 11 that the acquiring airline was bringing to the 12 and dead. And I can do that with fewer 12 13 observations. So I don't know how quite -- I would 13 transaction? quite use a continuous measure. And I -- I don't 14 14 A No. 15 know -- I don't know what advantage it would bring 15 Q And did you make any effort to assess 16 to the analysis here, frankly. 16 the value of the assets that American Airlines 17 Q Well, if you are trying to understand 17 Airlines was bringing to its transaction with TWA? 18 the -- understand and predict the likely outcome of 18 A 19 an arbitration involving seniority integration 19 Did you consider that irrelevant to 0 20 between TWA and American Airlines, isn't it 20 your analysis? 21 important to understand how arbitrators actually 21 A It is the same answer as I gave to the 22 22 last line of questions. come to their decisions? 23 Well, reading the arbitration reports, 23 Which is? Q 24 I read many of them, they talk in categories. They 24 Essentially, the acquiring airlines are A 25 say, airport A -- airline A was healthy. Airline B 25 in generally good shape. They are bringing

57 (Pages 219 to 222)

substantial assets to the – to the transaction. And this becomes a question of how much disadvantage the acquired airline is a basket case not bringing anything to the transaction or whether they are bringing real value. And the – the acquiring airlines, you know, are almost uniformly in good shape, bringing substantial assets. O And am I correct that you are not expressing an opinion in this case about whether the expressing an opinion in this case about whether the the TWA pilots pre-transaction career expectations of the TWA pilots? pre-transaction career expectations were with regard to income? A No. Q And do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots pre-transaction career expectations were with regard to income? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots expectations post-transaction? A No. Q Poirot to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Poirot to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or expectations with regard to income were post-transaction? A No. Q Poirot to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Poirot to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Poy to was now exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration its? A A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration its? A A Sea as a given I was — talking about — are packed to accompleted the TWA pilots of the comparable situations where the unions were than the transaction of the comparable of		T	
And this becomes a question of how much disadvantage to and that's what's relevant for that, whether the acquired airline is a basket case not bringing anything to the transaction or whether they are bringing real value. And the the acquiring airlines, you know, are almost uniformly in good shape, bringing substantial assets. Q And an locrect that you are not expectations of the TWA pilots are prepared to income? A That's correct. Q Do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots great and the they all they are the supplement CC preserved the pre-transaction career expectations of the TWA pilots are reparding income? A That's correct. Q Do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots great and the they present the present of the fact that they were understanding of what the TWA pilots are respectations with regard to income were any sunderstanding of what the TWA pilots are respectations with regard to income were poset-transaction? A No. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior t	223		225
2 And this becomes a question of how much disadvantage 4 and that's what's relevant for that, whether the 5 acquired airline is a basket case not bringing anything to the transaction or whether they are 7 bringing real value. And the – the acquiring airlines, you know, are almost uniformly in good 9 shape, bringing substantial assets. 10 Q And an I correct that you are not 11 expressing an opinion in this case about whether 12 Supplement CC preserved the pre-transaction career 13 expectations of the TWA pilots? 14 A That's correct. 15 Q Do you have an understanding of what 16 the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations 17 were with regard to income? 18 A No. 19 Q And do you have any understanding of 19 what the TWA pilots' expectations post-transaction 20 were regarding income? 21 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots or the 22 arear expectations with regard to income were 23 post-transaction; correct? 24 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots or the 25 drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 26 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots or the 27 A No. 28 Q Do you have any understanding of which 29 pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to 19 the transaction? 29 A No. 30 Q Do you have any understanding of which 31 pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to 32 the transaction? 33 A No. 34 A No. 45 Q Would that be relevant to the 46 construction of a merged seniority integration list? 47 A A Sa - as a given I was – talking 48 a No. 49 Q Would that be relevant to the 50 construction of a merged seniority integration list? 40 A No. 41 Q Would that be relevant to the 51 construction of a merged seniority integration list? 41 A No. 42 Q Would that be relevant to the 52 construction of a merged seniority integration list? 42 and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs 43 are a piece of career expectations. 44 A No. 45 Q Would that be relevant to the 56 construction of a merged seniority integration list? 46 A No. 47 Q Doyou have any understa	1 substantial assets to the to the transaction.	1	Q The only things you looked at were
the acquired airlines pilots are going to be under adhthat's what's relevant for that, whether the acquired airline is a basket case not bringing anything to the transaction or whether they are bringing real value. And the - the acquiring airlines, you know, are almost uniformly in good shape, bringing aubstantial assets. Q And am I correct that you are not expressing an opinion in this case about whether they are repetations of the TWA pilots? Q Do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations of the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations were with regard to income? A No. Q Other than the just pre-transaction of whether they are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have any understanding of which pilot around the further pilot and they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have any understanding of which pilot around the pilot around water and any understanding of which pilot around water and the pil	2 And this becomes a question of how much disadvantage	2	whether TWA, in your view, was going to stop flying
and that's what's relevant for that, whether the acquired airline is a basket case not bringing anything to the transaction or whether they are bringing real value. And the – the acquiring airlines, you know, are almost uniformly in good shape, bringing substantial assets. Q And am I correct that you are not ceptesting an opinion in this case about whether Supplement CC preserved the pre-transaction career expectations of the TWA pilots? A That's correct. A No. Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations were with regard to income? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations were regarding income? A No. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have post-transaction? A No. Q Proir to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the A No. Q Proir to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the A Ramerican Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which the transaction? A Correct. Let me say that I want to amend my answer. In fact, I did consider the fact that thoughs could be important. Furloughs, in particular of the combined airline could be important twent obe cided to use a bottom staple when transaction; A Correct. Let me say that I want to amend my answer. In fact, of the codied to use a bottom staple when transaction or the cided to use a bottom staple the bottom of the lote cided to use a bottom staple the bottom to furloughs. So if I stapled at the bottom to furloughs. So of I stapled the TWA pilots at the bottom, I was giving you a to be tourned the subtraction of the list? A No. Q Would take if from the fact t	3 the acquired airlines pilots are going to be under	3	imminently, and your conclusion that TWA was
sacquired airline is a basket case not bringing anything to the transaction or whether they are bringing real value. And the – the acquiring airlines, you know, are almost uniformly in good shape, bringing substantial assets. Q And am I correct that you are not expectations of the TWA pilots? A Thar's correct. Q Do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots pre-transaction career expectations of the TWA pilots pre-transaction career expectations were with regard to income? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots expectations post-transaction were regarding income? A No. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have A No. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have any understanding of which full thanks and you want to use a bottom staple is determined by the ratio, that – the ratio of the comparable group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full thanks and you have any understanding of which full tha		4	
anything to the transaction or whether they are pringing real value. And the the acquiring airlines, you know, are almost uniformly in good shape, bringing substantial assets. Q And am I correct that you are not expressing an opinion in this case about whether expressing an opinion in this case about whether expressing an opinion in this case about whether sexpressing an opinion in this case about whether the TWA pilots? A Thar's correct. Do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots pre-transaction career expectations of the TWA pilots pre-transaction career expectations with regard to income? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots expressing an opinion in the case about whether the TWA pilots of what the TWA pilots expectations post-transaction? A No. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have are post-transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Poyou have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the contract of the contraction of a merged seniority integration list? A A No. Q Would that be relevant to the contraction of the contraction of the contraction of a merged seniority integration its? A A No. Q Would that be relevant to the contraction of th		5	
bringing real value. And the the acquiring sharilines, you know, are almost uniformly in good shape, bringing substantial assets. Q And am I correct that you are not expectations in this case about whether expectations of the TWA pilots? A That's correct. Q Do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots of the TWA pilots of the		6	
a sirlines, you know, are almost uniformly in good shape, bringing substantial assets. Q And am I correct that you are not expressing an opinion in this case about whether Supplement CC preserved the pre-transaction career expectations of the TWA pilots? A That's correct. A No. Q And do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations were with regard to income? A I only take it from the fact that they sus expressing income? A I only take it from the fact that they career expectations with regard to income were drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have A No. Q Other than the inferences you are career expectations with regard to income were career expectations A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which probably to the mergand to income were career expec		7	
shape, bringing substantial assets. Q And am I correct that you are not expectations of the TWA pilots? A That's correct. Q Do you have an understanding of what the the TWA pilots' expectations are expectations were warning income? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots' expectations post-transaction ever egarding income? A No. A I only take it from the fact that they sued, that they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to full oughs? A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the full transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of what the full pilot group was more exposed to full oughs? A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the full transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to full oughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to full oughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to full oughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to full oughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to full oughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to full oughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to full oughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to full oughs? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to full oughs prior to the transaction group was more exposed to full oughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to full oughs prior to the transaction? A No.		8	
Q And am I correct that you are not supplement CC preserved the pre-transaction career expectations of the TWA pilots? 12		1	
expressing an opinion in this case about whether Supplement CC preserved the pre-transaction career A That's correct. Q Do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations were with regard to income? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations whether the TWA pilots' pre-transaction post-transaction what the TWA pilots' expectations post-transaction what the TWA pilots were much diminished. A I only take it from the fact that they sued, that they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots' career expectations with regard to income were post-transaction? A No. 224 Q Other than the inferences you are any expending of what the TWA pilots of the litigation, do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction of a merged seniority integration list? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction. A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction of a merged seniority integration list? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction. A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction. A No. Q Mould that be relevant to the construction of		10	
supplement CC preserved the pre-transaction career expectations of the TWA pilots? A That's correct. Q Do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations of the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations of the two pilots at the bottom. I was giving you a conservative estimate of what would have happened in the but-for scenario. Q How — how did you come up with the number of pilots that you thought should be stapled to the bottom of the list? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots' expectations post-transaction were regarding income? A I only take it from the fact that they suspense the form the fact that they and the they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the littigation, do you have 224 225 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots' career expectations with regard to income were post-transaction? A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list?		11	
the bottom to furloughs. So if I stapled the TWA pilots? A That's correct. Do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations with regard to income? The standard proposed in the state that they were regarding income? A I only take it from the fact that they were regarding income? A I only take it from the fact that they were that they were that the the the the the the the the the th		1	
A That's correct. Q Do you have an understanding of what the tTWA pilots 'per-transaction career expectations were with regard to income? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots' expectations post-transaction were regarding income? A I only take it from the fact that they 22 sued, that they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are 4 drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 25 drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 25 drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 26 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots or the 27 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots or the 28 A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the 4 American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the 5 furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which 10 pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which 11 pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which 12 pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which 15 pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Mould that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As a -a a a given I was - talking about - it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition and - and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. The transaction of the tire of what the USD, and the three with the number of pilots to the bottom, I was giving wounden to the buttong the the number of pilots that you thought should be tapled to the bottom the number of pilots at the bottom, I was giving von acco	1 11 1 1	1	
Do you have an understanding of what the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations were with regard to income? A No. O And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots' expectations post-transaction were regarding income? A I only take it from the fact that they sued, that they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have a drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have a drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have a drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have a post-transaction? A No. 224 1 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots' career expectations with regard to income were any understanding of what the TWA pilots of the any is were more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Do you dud that be relevant to the transaction? A No. Q Do you dud that be relevant to the transaction? A No. A No. Q Do you do that be relevant to the transaction? A No. A			
the TWA pilots' pre-transaction career expectations were with regard to income? A No. 181 A No. 291 What the TWA pilots' expectations post-transaction were regarding income? A I only take it from the fact that they sued, that they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are 252 drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 252 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots' career expectations with regard to income were post-transaction? A No. 2024 A No. 4 A Men- 18 A No. 9 Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs? A No. 9 A No. 9 A No. 10 A No. 10 A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 10 A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 10 A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 10 A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 10 A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 10 A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 10 A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 10 A No. 10 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 11 Dilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. 12 Dilot than you proposed under your list? A No. 13 Dilot the potton of the list? A No. 14 Dilot the bottom of the list? A Say that again. A No. 15 Dilot the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you propose in your best estimate list, would have happened in the construc	15 O Do you have an understanding of what		
were with regard to income? A No. Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots' expectations post-transaction were regarding income? A I only take it from the fact that they sued, that they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have any understanding of wart to use a bottom staple, the bottom staple is determined by the ratio, that — the ratio of the comparable group. If you want to achieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom staple, the bottom staple is determined by the ratio you want to achieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom staple, the bottom staple is determined by the ratio you want to achieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom staple, the bottom staple is determined by the ratio you want to achieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom staple, the bottom staple is determined by the ratio of the comparable group. If you want to achieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom of the list? A When — it — it is actually determined by the ratio, that — the ratio of the comparable group. If you want to achieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom of the comparable group. If you want to achieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom of the comparable group. If you want to achieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom staple, the bottom of the comparable group. If you want to achieve that ratio and you want to achieve that ratio and you want to achieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom of the list? A When — it — it is actually determined by the ratio, that — the ratio of the comparable group. If you want to achieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom staple, the bottom of the tinstore that ratio and			
18			
19 Q And do you have any understanding of what the TWA pilots' expectations post-transaction were regarding income? 22 A I only take it from the fact that they sued, that they were much diminished. 23 sued, that they were much diminished. 24 Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 25 drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 26 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots' career expectations with regard to income were post-transaction? 4 A No. 5 Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs? 9 A No. 0 Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? 10 Q Do you have any understanding of which construction of a merged seniority integration list? 11 A No. 12 Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? 13 A No. 14 Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? 15 A As as a given I was talking about it is is actually determined by the ratio on the cachieve that ratio and you want to use a bottom staple, the bottom staple is determined by the ratio, that the ratio of the comparable group. 24 determined by the ratio, that the ratio of the comparable group. 25 Q Would it affect your analysis had you 26	<u> </u>	18	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
what the TWA pilots' expectations post-transaction were regarding income? A I only take it from the fact that they such, that they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 224 A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the courser construction of a merged seniority integration list? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the courser of an analysis when I consider financial condition and — and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations; 20 A When — it — it is actually determined by the ratio of the comparable group. If you want to achieve that ratio and you want to achieve. 224 E25 A No. Q Proir to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots than you proposed under your list? A A No. Q Prou duth the TWA pilots of fered to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A A No. Q And why is that? A A That's because my analysis simply asks what would have happened — it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were both — there was no — no — no allegation	19 O And do you have any understanding of	1	
were regarding income? 2			
A I only take it from the fact that they sued, that they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 224 25 drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 224 1 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots' career expectations with regard to income were post-transaction? 4 A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Would it affect your analysis had you 226 known that the TWA pilots offered to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A Say that again. Q If the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you propose in your best estimate list, would that have affected your analysis? A No. Q And why is that? A No. Q And why is that? A No. Q Would it affect your analysis had you 226 known that the TWA pilots offered to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A No. Q If the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A No. Q And why is that? A No. Q And why is that? A No. 10 O Would it affect your analysis sind you 11 known that the TWA pilots offered to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A Say that again. Q If the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A No. Q And why is that? A No. Q And why is that? A No. Q Would it affect your analysis when lead the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple what would have happened in comparable situations where the union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. A As - as a given		1	
sued, that they were much diminished. Q Other than the inferences you are drawing from the fact of the litigation, do you have 224 226 1 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots' career expectations with regard to income were post-transaction? A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to the transaction? A No. Q Would that the TWA pilots of the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you propose in your best estimate list, would that have affected your analysis? A No. Q And why is that? A No. Q And why is that? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As as a given I was talking about career expectations. A No. A As as a given I was talking and u- and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; 23 want to use a bottom staple, be bottom staple, we determined by the ratio you want to achieve. Q Would it affect your analysis had you known that the TWA pilots offered to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A No. Q If the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you propose in your best estimate list, would that have affected your analysis? A No. Q And why is that? A That's because my analysis simply asks what would have happened it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were both there was no no no allegation that either union or the union representation. And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have lo		1	
determined by the ratio you want to achieve. 224 226 227 228 229 229 220 220 220 221 222 222		,	• • •
25		1	
224 any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots' career expectations with regard to income were post-transaction? A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A A Sa - as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. A Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; A Known that the TWA pilots of test known that the TWA pilots of staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A Say that again. Q If the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you propose dunder your list? A No. Q If the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A No. Q If the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A No. Q If the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A No. Q If the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A No. Q And why is that? A No. A That's because my analysis simply asks what would have happened it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were both there was no no - no allegation that either union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to sapple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you sa		25	
any actual knowledge concerning what the TWA pilots' career expectations with regard to income were post-transaction? A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As - as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. A As and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. A No did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots of what the TWA pilots of fered to staple more pilots than you proposed under your list? A Say that again. A Say that again. A No gurdent TWA pilots of he course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you propose in your best estimate list, would that have affected your analysis? A No. Q And why is that? A That's because my analysis simply asks what would have happened it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were both there was no no no allegation that either union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. A As as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition A and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; 23 furloughs as a component of career expectations;			
2 career expectations with regard to income were 3 post-transaction? 4 A No. 5 Q Prior to the transaction, did you form 6 any views about whether the TWA pilots or the 7 American Airlines pilots were more exposed to 8 furloughs? 9 A No. 10 Q Do you have any understanding of which 11 pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to 12 the transaction? 13 A No. 14 Q Would that be relevant to the 15 course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you propose in your best estimate list, would that have affected your analysis? 10 A No. 11 A No. 12 A That's because my analysis simply asks what would have happened — it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were both — there was no — no — no allegation that either union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. 12 In A No I I Said that's what would have happened here. So I did not — I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. 15 I did not — I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. 16 And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not — I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. 17 Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; 18 poposals. 19 Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like			
post-transaction? A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to the transaction? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; A No. A Say that again. Q If the TWA pilots had proposed in the course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you propose in your best estimate list, would that have affected your analysis? A No. A That's because my analysis simply asks what would have happened it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were both there was no no no allegation that either union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
A No. Q Prior to the transaction, did you form any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs? A No. Q Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to the transaction? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. A No and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; A No. Q Nould that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As as a given I was talking and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. A No directly at exposure to g Prior to the transaction, did you form course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you propose in your best estimate list, would that have affected your analysis? A No. Q And why is that? A That's because my analysis simply asks what would have happened it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were both there was no no no allegation that either union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like		I .	
5 Q Prior to the transaction, did you form 6 any views about whether the TWA pilots or the 7 American Airlines pilots were more exposed to 8 furloughs? 9 A No. 9 Q Do you have any understanding of which 11 pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to 12 the transaction? 13 A No. 14 Q Would that be relevant to the 15 construction of a merged seniority integration list? 16 A As as a given I was talking 17 about it is the same answer as when we were 18 talking about career expectations. 19 To and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs 20 Q You didn't look directly at exposure to 21 furloughs as a component of career expectations; 22 Q You didn't look directly at exposure to 23 furloughs as a component of career expectations; 25 course of negotiation to staple more pilots than you 26 propose in your best estimate list, would that have 27 affected your analysis? 8 A No. 9 Q And why is that? 10 A That's because my analysis simply asks 11 what would have happened it asked, what happened 12 in comparable situations where the unions were 13 both there was no no no allegation that 14 either union or the union representing either group 15 of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. 16 And I said that's what would have happened here. So 1 I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' 18 proposals. 19 proposals. 19 proposals. 20 Q And if it turns out that the TWA 20 at a piece of career expectations. 21 to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you 22 saying that your best estimate is a more accurate 23 furloughs as a component of career expectations; 24 to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you 25 reflection of what the list would have looked like	•	1	
any views about whether the TWA pilots or the American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs? A No. Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; A merican Airlines pilots were more exposed to affected your analysis? A No. Q And why is that? A No. A That's because my analysis simply asks what would have happened it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were both there was no no no allegation that either union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like	1	1	
American Airlines pilots were more exposed to furloughs? A No. Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; affected your analysis? A No. A No. D Q And why is that? A That's because my analysis simply asks what would have happened it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were both there was no no no allegation that either union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
furloughs? A No. Do you have any understanding of which pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. R A No. B A No. A That's because my analysis simply asks what happened it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were in comparable situations where the unions were in comparable situations where the unions were of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. A As as a given I was talking in the analysis when I consider financial condition and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; A No. 13 both there was no no no allegation that either union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. 19 Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
9 A No. 10 Q Do you have any understanding of which 11 pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to 12 the transaction? 13 A No. 14 Q Would that be relevant to the 15 construction of a merged seniority integration list? 16 A As as a given I was talking 17 about it is the same answer as when we were 18 talking about career expectations. That's implicit 19 in the analysis when I consider financial condition 20 and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs 21 are a piece of career expectations. 22 Q You didn't look directly at exposure to 23 furloughs as a component of career expectations; 24 A No. 26 A No. 27 A No. 28 A No. 29 And why is that? 20 A That's because my analysis simply asks 21 what would have happened it asked, what happened 21 in comparable situations where the unions were 22 A No. 23 A No. 24 C A No. 25 A That's because my analysis simply asks 26 And why is that? 26 A That's because my analysis simply asks 26 What would have happened it asked, what happened 27 in comparable situations where the unions were 28 A No. 29 And I said that's what would have happened it asked, what happened 29 And I said that's what would have happened it asked, what happened 20 fild not no no allegation that 21 did not I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' 29 Proposals. 20 And if it turns out that the TWA 20 pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered 20 to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you 21 saying that your best estimate is a more accurate 22 reflection of what the list would have looked like	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	
10 Q Do you have any understanding of which 11 pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to 12 the transaction? 13 A No. 14 Q Would that be relevant to the 15 construction of a merged seniority integration list? 16 A As as a given I was talking 17 about it is the same answer as when we were 18 talking about career expectations. That's implicit 19 in the analysis when I consider financial condition 20 and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs 21 are a piece of career expectations. 22 Q You didn't look directly at exposure to 23 furloughs as a component of career expectations; 21 the transaction? 22 A That's because my analysis simply asks 24 what would have happened it asked, what happened 25 in comparable situations where the unions were 26 in comparable situations where the unions were 27 allegation that 28 what would have happened it asked, what happened 29 in comparable situations where the unions were 20 allegation that 20 in there was no no no allegation that 21 either union or the union representing either group 25 of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. 26 And I said that's what would have happened it asked, what happened 27 in comparable situations where the unions were 28 in comparable situations where the unions were 29 in comparable situations where the unions were 29 in comparable situations where the unions were 20 in comparable situations where the unions were 21 in comparable situations where the unions were 21 in comparable situations where the union representing either group 29 of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. 29 And I said that's what would have happened here. So 20 I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' 20 pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered 21 to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you 22 saying that your best estimate is a more accurate 23 reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
pilot group was more exposed to furloughs prior to the transaction? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; 11 what would have happened it asked, what happened in comparable situations where the unions were both there was no no no allegation that either union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. A As as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit proposals. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
the transaction? A No. Q Would that be relevant to the construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As as a given I was talking 16 A As as a given I was talking 17 about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; 12 in comparable situations where the unions were both both there was no no no allegation that either union or the union representing either group of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. A As as a given I was talking 16 And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
13 A No. 14 Q Would that be relevant to the 15 construction of a merged seniority integration list? 16 A As as a given I was talking 17 about it is the same answer as when we were 18 talking about career expectations. That's implicit 19 in the analysis when I consider financial condition 20 and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs 21 are a piece of career expectations. 22 Q You didn't look directly at exposure to 23 furloughs as a component of career expectations; 21 both there was no no no allegation that 24 either union or the union representing either group 25 of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. 26 And I said that's what would have happened here. So 27 I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' 28 proposals. 29 Q And if it turns out that the TWA 20 pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered 21 to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you 22 saying that your best estimate is a more accurate 23 reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
14 Q Would that be relevant to the 15 construction of a merged seniority integration list? 16 A As as a given I was talking 17 about it is the same answer as when we were 18 talking about career expectations. That's implicit 19 in the analysis when I consider financial condition 20 and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs 21 are a piece of career expectations. 22 Q You didn't look directly at exposure to 23 furloughs as a component of career expectations; 24 either union or the union representing either group 25 of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. 26 And I said that's what would have happened here. So 27 I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' 28 proposals. 29 Q And if it turns out that the TWA 20 pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered 21 to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you 22 saying that your best estimate is a more accurate 23 reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
construction of a merged seniority integration list? A As as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; 15 of pilots shirked their duty of fair representation. And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
A As as a given I was talking about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; And I said that's what would have happened here. So I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' proposals. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like	·	\$	
about it is the same answer as when we were talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; I did not I did not analyze the TWA pilots' PQ And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
talking about career expectations. That's implicit in the analysis when I consider financial condition and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; 18 proposals. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like		i	
in the analysis when I consider financial condition and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q And if it turns out that the TWA pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you aying that your best estimate is a more accurate furloughs as a component of career expectations; reflection of what the list would have looked like		1	
and and value brought to the merger. Furloughs are a piece of career expectations. Q You didn't look directly at exposure to furloughs as a component of career expectations; pilots, in the course of negotiations, had offered to staple 464 pilots to the end of the list, are you saying that your best estimate is a more accurate reflection of what the list would have looked like	, , ,	1	
21 are a piece of career expectations. 22	,	1	~
Q You didn't look directly at exposure to 22 saying that your best estimate is a more accurate 23 furloughs as a component of career expectations; 23 reflection of what the list would have looked like	ž č	1	
23 furloughs as a component of career expectations; 23 reflection of what the list would have looked like	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	
	· ·	1	
24 correct? 24 had negotiations continued and resulted in an			
		24	had negotiations continued and resulted in an
25 A Correct. 25 agreement?	25 A Correct.	25	agreement?

58 (Pages 223 to 226)

A No. The problem is that TWA's proposals during negotiations were tainted by ALPA's failure to represent them adequately, so they don't -- they don't reflect what TWA's proposals would have been had -- TWA pilots' proposals would have been, had been had adequately their represented. So they are not -- they are not meaningful because they are not about a world in which they are adequately represented.

BY MR. TOAL:

Q And what's your basis for saying that any TWA proposal -- any proposal by the TWA pilots was influenced by their perception that there was a breach of the duty of fair representation?

A The court has already decided there was a duty of fair representation. I'm relying on that court's finding. And what I'm saying is that -- you are asking me, is there any value in the behavior of a group that has not been -- in -- in -- in the specifics of a proposal made by a group that is not adequately represented, when what I'm trying to do is ask what would have happened if they were adequately represented. And I have a way of doing that. You can agree or disagree with my way of doing that, but I have a way of doing that. And what -- what happened going down the path at TWA --

Q Are you aware that Rikk Salamat used the negotiation history as a basis for what he determined would have been the but-for list?

A No

Q And do you think that was inappropriate?

A I don't know whether it was appropriate or inappropriate, but I would not have done it.

Q Did the -- when you -- when you say that the court found that there was a breach of duty, breach of the duty of fair representation, are you referring to the jury?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Did the jury say anything about when that breach started?

A The jury just said there was a breach of duty. It didn't -- I have the same two pages.

Q So do you know whether any offer made by the TWA pilots regarding seniority integration preceded or followed an alleged breach of the duty of fair representation?

A I'm starting from the presumption, and maybe this -- and you can quarrel with me if you would like, that the whole process was tainted by ALPA's failure of their duty of breach. You called

with TWA's pilots without fair representation doesn't shed any light for me on what would have happened had they been adequately represented.

Q But my question to you is, do you -what's your factual basis for saying that any proposal from the TWA pilots was influenced by their perception that there was a breach of a duty of fair representation?

MR. PRESS: Just, I object to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I don't know how else to understand a breach of duty of fair representation other than that it affects the outcome. I don't have a factual basis other than the fact that a jury found that ALPA violated their duty of fair representation. That's the fact. From that point forward, you are asking me to conjecture what I was asked to do. Conjecture is the wrong word. What I was asked to do is come up with an estimate of what would have happened had ALPA not violated their duty of fair representation. And to do that, I can't use the behavior of ALPA and TWA pilots in a world where ALPA had not done — the fact is that ALPA didn't do their duty. That's the fact.

it the breach of their duty of fair representation, so that I'm not looking at the timing.

Q Is that an assumption that you are making, or you have some factual support for the view that the entire process was tainted?

A What -- what I read in the way of backgrounds without -- you know, I haven't read the factual record on this, was that there were allegations that ALPA was interested in getting the American pilots to be ALPA pilots, and as a result, they, you know, some people argued that ALPA was willing to sell the TWA pilots down the river to curry favor with the American pilots.

Q And are you accepting those allegations as true?

A I'm not accepting -- I'm simply saying that the background that I read suggested that that was going on, and that this started early, and, you know, makes me worry about using the record of the negotiations of TWA at any point. And so, I'm not aware that it's been established by anyone when such a breach started. Whether, you know, I don't know that they were diligently representing the TWA pilots and then stopped one day, or whether, from the beginning of the whole process, the whole dance

59 (Pages 227 to 230)

DEGNAN & BATEMAN (856) 232-7400

231 233 with American, they never represented the pilots, I 1 between April 2001 and April 2002. In other words, how were flight assignments made? What seniority 2 don't -- I just don't know the answer to that. 2 3 3 Q If you were to learn that TWA, the TWA list was in place in that year? 4 So assume that the TWA pilots were in a 4 pilots made proposals about bottom staples prior to 5 separate subsidiary of American Airlines and were on 5 any breach of a duty of fair representation, would 6 6 that affect your analysis? a separate seniority list prior to April of 2002. 7 7 To be honest, until you started this A That was effectively their old TWA 8 8 line of questioning, I never understood the breach seniority list? 9 9 of duty of fair representation as linked to a single Q Right. 10 date or event. I viewed it as, in this process, the 10 And they were flying only their old TWA 11 TWA pilots were not adequately represented, and 11 flights, and no American pilots -- it was as if they had never been acquired? 12 that's how -- and that's the assumption I'm making. 12 13 O Correct. They were a subsidiary of --13 In this process, the TWA pilots are not adequately 14 a separate subsidiary of American Airlines. 14 represented. And -- and -- and so I don't know what 15 to make sense of a hypothetical that says as of a 15 Yeah. I actually -- I know I led 16 you -- I led you down this path of telling me about 16 particular date, because I don't understand the 17 the timing, but I'm not -- I'm really not sure of 17 timing. I don't know what events we are talking 18 how to answer when it would be appropriate. In 18 about. I have no way of answering that. 19 fact, when I do this kind of work, I would probably 19 Q Have you analyzed whether the TWA 20 ask the attorneys with whom I'm working when -- when 20 pilots were better off under Supplement CC than they 21 had been prior to the transaction when they were at 21 I ought to be starting calculation of damages. I 22 22 don't have a professional economist's view of that. TWA? 23 23 You would just take direction from A 24 counsel on that issue? 24 Q Is that relevant to your analysis? 25 25 A On a question of when, I would discuss A 232 234 Do you have a view about at what period 1 with counsel. And if they told me it was an issue 1 2 of economics, I would then try to come up with an 2 in time it is appropriate to start calculating 3 3 answer. But that's not the way I would get at that. damages in -- in this case relative to when 4 Did you analyze whether any of your 4 Supplement CC was implemented? 5 5 seven comparator arbitrations successfully preserved I have no view of that. A 6 6 the pre-transaction career expectations of each And what is the earliest point at which 7 7 pilot group? you think it would be appropriate to start 8 8 A No. calculating damages? 9 9 Have you done any independent research A I've never thought of that -- thought O 10 10 into the facts underlying the seven comparator about that. Can you think about it now? 11 11 transactions that you looked at? 0 12 Do you mean independent of the 12 A A I don't think I understand the timing 13 documents that I -- I cite here? 13 well enough relative to the timing of the -- of the acquisition of TWA. I don't -- Supplement CC was 14 Independent of reviewing the 14 15 arbitration decision itself, for instance? 15 several -- what happened, the acquisition was completed in April? You have to tell me more about 16 No. Well, if the arbitration decision 16 17 had complete information -- no -- sufficient 17 the timing for me to know that. I just don't. 18 So if you -- if you assume that 18 information, I should say, for me to figure out 19 whether it met my criteria. I -- I don't think I 19 Supplement CC went into effect in April of 2002, and 20 20 went further, though. the deal was -- the deal closed in April of 2001 --21 21 And in most of the situations did the 22 0 -- what's the earliest point at which 22 arbitration decision contain sufficient information you think it is appropriate to start calculating 23 for you to make those determinations? 23 24 24 damages? A Yes. I would have to know what happened 25 And in which instances did the 25 0

60 (Pages 231 to 234)

1	235		237
1	arbitration decision not contain sufficient	1	A Yes.
2	information?	2	Q And do you agree that the TWA pilots
3	A As I again, there is Delta/Pan Am,	3	received a significant reward going from TWA to
4	which is not an arbitration decision, where we	4	American Airlines as part of that transaction?
5	certainly had to go outside. I believe in the paper	5	MR. PRESS: I object to the form of the
6	I footnote the cases which I can't I don't have	6	question.
7	in my head where we have if there is any, where I	7	THE WITNESS: I I have no idea.
8	have to use outside information. There may or may	8	BY MR. TOAL:
9	not have been.	9	Q You have no idea, why?
10	Q So one of the transactions that you	10	A I haven't examined that question.
11	looked at that you identified as a comparable	11	Q Would that have been important to take
12	transaction involved Flying Tiger and Seaboard;	12	into consideration in trying to come up with an
13	correct?	13	an estimate of what a alternative seniority
14	A Yes.	14	integration list in this case would have looked
15	Q And why did you consider that a	15	like?
16	comparable transaction?	16	MR. PRESS: I object to the form of the
17	A I think that's a I without	17	question. What is it?
18	remembering the precise details, these are two	18	THE WITNESS: Well, as I said, you
19	freight carriers. The arbitrator felt that Seaboard	19	know, I I I know I keep giving the same
20	brought things of real value to the transaction. It	20	answer. Implicitly, I take account of that in
21	was still flying. It was not about to stop flying.	21	choosing the set of comparables, so that the
22	So the same thing that made me, you know, choose the	22	seniority integration that arbitrators tend to
23	others. It met it met the criterion. And,	23	impose reflects reflects those factors. You
24	again, we can calculate the mean rank difference.	24	know, they say they try to balance career
25	(Farber-10 Document regarding Flying	25	expectations. You are asking about career
-	236		238
1	Tiger Lines and Seaboard World Airlines	1	expectations again, which I implicitly take into
2	marked for identification.)	2	account.
3	BY MR. TOAL:	3	BY MR. TOAL:
4	Q I show you document entitled Flying	4	Q Do you see the the date of this
5	Tiger Lines and Seaboard World Airlines, which I	5	decision is 1981?
6	marked as Farber Exhibit-10. Let me know if you	6	A 37
I			A Yes.
7	personally reviewed this decision.	7	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this
7 8	personally reviewed this decision. A I did.	7 8	
1	and the second s	ļ.	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this
8	A I did.	8 9 10	 Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes.
8 9	A I did.Q Let me direct your attention to page	8 9	 Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom
8 9 10	 A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a 	8 9 10 11 12	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has
8 9 10 11	A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers?	8 9 10 11	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout
8 9 10 11 12	 A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the arbitrator evaluated the financial condition of both 	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s?
8 9 10 11 12 13	 A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the 	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s? A Yes.
8 9 10 11 12 13	A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the arbitrator evaluated the financial condition of both the acquiring and the acquired airline; correct? A Yes, yes.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s? A Yes. Q Was that true of TWA? Had it achieved
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the arbitrator evaluated the financial condition of both the acquiring and the acquired airline; correct? A Yes, yes. Q And toward the end of the first	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s? A Yes. Q Was that true of TWA? Had it achieved profits on a regular basis in the decade prior to
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the arbitrator evaluated the financial condition of both the acquiring and the acquired airline; correct? A Yes, yes. Q And toward the end of the first paragraph the decision says, for pilots in a weak or	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s? A Yes. Q Was that true of TWA? Had it achieved profits on a regular basis in the decade prior to its acquisition?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the arbitrator evaluated the financial condition of both the acquiring and the acquired airline; correct? A Yes, yes. Q And toward the end of the first paragraph the decision says, for pilots in a weak or tentative carrier, receipt of jobs and job	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s? A Yes. Q Was that true of TWA? Had it achieved profits on a regular basis in the decade prior to its acquisition? A I don't know.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the arbitrator evaluated the financial condition of both the acquiring and the acquired airline; correct? A Yes, yes. Q And toward the end of the first paragraph the decision says, for pilots in a weak or tentative carrier, receipt of jobs and job protection with a healthy and expanding carrier	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s? A Yes. Q Was that true of TWA? Had it achieved profits on a regular basis in the decade prior to its acquisition? A I don't know. Q Do you know, prior to the acquisition
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the arbitrator evaluated the financial condition of both the acquiring and the acquired airline; correct? A Yes, yes. Q And toward the end of the first paragraph the decision says, for pilots in a weak or tentative carrier, receipt of jobs and job protection with a healthy and expanding carrier represents a significant reward which is an	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s? A Yes. Q Was that true of TWA? Had it achieved profits on a regular basis in the decade prior to its acquisition? A I don't know. Q Do you know, prior to the acquisition by American Airlines, when the last time that TWA
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the arbitrator evaluated the financial condition of both the acquiring and the acquired airline; correct? A Yes, yes. Q And toward the end of the first paragraph the decision says, for pilots in a weak or tentative carrier, receipt of jobs and job protection with a healthy and expanding carrier represents a significant reward which is an important factor in balancing the advantages that	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s? A Yes. Q Was that true of TWA? Had it achieved profits on a regular basis in the decade prior to its acquisition? A I don't know. Q Do you know, prior to the acquisition by American Airlines, when the last time that TWA had earned a profit was?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the arbitrator evaluated the financial condition of both the acquiring and the acquired airline; correct? A Yes, yes. Q And toward the end of the first paragraph the decision says, for pilots in a weak or tentative carrier, receipt of jobs and job protection with a healthy and expanding carrier represents a significant reward which is an important factor in balancing the advantages that each group obtain from the merger. Do you see that?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s? A Yes. Q Was that true of TWA? Had it achieved profits on a regular basis in the decade prior to its acquisition? A I don't know. Q Do you know, prior to the acquisition by American Airlines, when the last time that TWA had earned a profit was? A No.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A I did. Q Let me direct your attention to page 146 of this decision. Do you see there is a heading, the financial strength of the two carriers? A Yes. Q So at least in this decision, the arbitrator evaluated the financial condition of both the acquiring and the acquired airline; correct? A Yes, yes. Q And toward the end of the first paragraph the decision says, for pilots in a weak or tentative carrier, receipt of jobs and job protection with a healthy and expanding carrier represents a significant reward which is an important factor in balancing the advantages that	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q Okay. If you turn to page 147 of this decision, do you understand SWA was the abbreviation for Seaboard? A Yes. Q Okay. So do you see in the bottom paragraph on this page it says, overall, SWA has achieved net profits on a regular basis throughout the 1970s? A Yes. Q Was that true of TWA? Had it achieved profits on a regular basis in the decade prior to its acquisition? A I don't know. Q Do you know, prior to the acquisition by American Airlines, when the last time that TWA had earned a profit was?

61 (Pages 235 to 238)

239 241 1 with them the prospect of pilot jobs; correct? O Why not? 2 2 I believe that everything I list here A Because, as I said, I -- you are asking 3 me -- essentially trying to ask me a similar set 3 would suggest to me that it brings jobs, the assets 4 for airlines -- create business and create jobs. of -- to get me to say there is a more continuous 5 5 Hubs, routes or route authority, gates at busy measure of financial viability that you would like me to look at, and I said I can't do that because of 6 airports, desirable equipment, those are all things 6 7 lack of -- of number of cases. So what I simply do 7 that create jobs. 8 8 And what -- what assets of substantial is look at the overall situation, and figure out 9 9 value did you determine TWA was bringing to this whether I think the airline -- this airline's still 10 operating is key, and is it likely to shut down 10 transaction? 11 immediately, yes or no. 11 A Right. My understanding is they -- in 12 So wouldn't the record of profitability 12 no particular order, the -- the -- the hub in 13 13 St. Louis. Valuable gates at -- I believe at JFK. be relevant to whether the airline was likely to 14 14 Valuable gates, I think, was it -- I -- I can't be continue flying? 15 MR. PRESS: I object to the form of the 15 sure. I'll say Washington National. They 16 question. Improper speculative hypothetical. 16 brought -- they brought equipment that apparently 17 THE WITNESS: What matters is -- is 17 was -- was of real value, equipment both that they 18 more the current situation. The long history is 18 had and equipment that was on order. They -- and 19 less -- is less relevant. I -- I don't --19 they had -- you know, they had the -- basically, the 20 20 BY MR. TOAL: gates in St. Louis, the gates -- the gates in JFK, I 21 believe gates in Washington. That particularly gave 21 O But you didn't look at the current 22 them a lot of market share in St. Louis and a lot of 22 situation for TWA either; right? 23 Well, I looked at the situation. They 23 market share at JFK, and TWA was a big player at 24 JFK, and those were of real value. And this --24 were still flying. They had assets. They had 25 25 liabilities -- I agree they had big liabilities but anyway, that's --240 242 they had assets, and they seemed like a weak, viable 1 Did you make any effort to quantify the 1 2 2 value of those assets? airline. So --3 Were -- how did TWA's liabilities at 3 A No. Q 4 Why -- why do you consider the 4 the time of the acquisition compare to the size of 0 5 St. Louis hub to be something that was valuable? 5 its assets? 6 This was -- this was considered 6 A I don't know. 7 7 valuable by American Airlines. I saw a presentation So that's not something you looked at Q 8 8 -- there was sort of a slide presentation in one of either? 9 9 the exhibits from American Airlines explaining why That's correct. A 10 10 the TWA acquisition was going to be really valuable Paragraph 37 of your report. 11 MR. PRESS: Which paragraph? 11 for American Airlines. And it listed the St. Louis 12 hub as a valuable thing. So, I'm just --12 MR. TOAL: 37. 13 So you're relying on that presentation? 13 BY MR. TOAL: O 14 I'm relying on that presentation. 14 You say, another factor that is often A 15 Did you do any work beyond looking at 15 considered in balancing career prospects, is whether that presentation and trying to assess the value of one airline brings to the combined company something 16 16 17 assets that TWA was bringing to the transaction? 17 of substantial value. Do you see that? 18 18 A Yes. A Well, wouldn't it be more relevant to 19 Did you evaluate what TWA's route 19 0 20 structure was at the time of the transaction? 20 the analysis of seniority integration to ask what 21 21 each airline brought to the transaction that had the A 22 prospect of creating sustainable pilot jobs? 22 0 Do you know if it was primarily a domestic airline at the time of the transaction? 23 A I'm really not sure of what you are 23 24 24 asking. How is that different? A 25 Do you know how many flights per day it 25 Well, some assets may -- may not carry Q

62 (Pages 239 to 242)

	243		245
		1	the 2300 jobs that TWA brings enables American to
1 2	had?	1 2	eliminate a thousand American jobs.
2	A No.	3	Q So my only question is whether that's
3	Q Do you know how highly leveraged it	4	at least potentially relevant to your analysis.
4	was?	5	A No. What's relevant is the question of
5	A No.	1	whether TWA brings value to the transaction.
6	Q And was none of that relevant to your	6 7	
7	analysis?	1	Q And would the issue of how many jobs are coming over relative to the number of pilots
8	A What was relevant to my analysis was,	8	coming over have the potential to affect the value
9	was the airline flying and, number two, did they	9	of the assets that are coming over?
10	bring things of value to the transaction. Those are	10	
11	what was relevant to my analysis.	11	
12	Q And would any of the considerations	12	to the number of pilots coming over, and it's what
13	that I mentioned impact any of those factors that	13	happens after that that changes the number of jobs.
14	you took into consideration, at least potentially?	14	So I don't understand the framing of the question as
15	A No.	15	how many jobs do you bring over.
16	Q Did you analyze how many jobs TWA was	16	(Farber-11 Letter dated July 18, 2001
17	expected to contribute to the combined entity?	17	between Ed White and Michael Day marked for
18	A No.	18	identification.)
19	Q And, specifically, did you look at how	19	BY MR. TOAL:
20	many pilot jobs TWA was expected to bring to the	20	Q Let me show you a letter that I will
21	combined entity?	21	mark as Farber Exhibit-11, dated July 18, 2001,
22	A No.	22	which is between Captain Ed White and Captain
23	Q Did you consider how many pilot jobs	23	Michael Day.
24	TWA was expected to bring to the combined entity	24	Can you let me know if you've seen this
25	relative to the number of pilots that it would bring	25	document before?
	244		246
1	to the combined entity?	1	A I may have, but I don't recall anything
2	A Well, if I couldn't didn't consider	2	specific about it.
3	the number of TWA pilot jobs, I don't see how I can	3	Q Okay. And do you know who Captain Day
4	do it relative to the number of pilots.	4	is?
5	Q So the answer would be no?	5	A It says here he is the chairman of the
6	A Right.	6	TWA MEC.
7	Q Would that be relevant to your analysis	7	Q And independent of this document, did
8	of the value of the assets that TWA was bringing to	8	you have any knowledge who Captain Day was?
9	the transaction?	9	A No.
10	A I don't know how how I understand	10	Q Do you know who Captain White is, who
11	bringing what bringing jobs exactly means.	11	sent the letter?
12	Q Well, if if you had a population of	12	A Only only from earlier in this
13	2300 pilots, but the plan by the acquiring airline	13	deposition.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	14	Q Okay. Let me direct your attention to
1 14	was to reduce the number of TWA routes and planes so		Q Okay. Let me direct your attention to
14 15	was to reduce the number of TWA routes and planes so that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might	15	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point
15	that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might	i	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point
15 16	that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might that be relevant to the value of the assets that TWA	15	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point on the top of this page? It says, similarly, in
15 16 17	that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might that be relevant to the value of the assets that TWA was expected to bring to the transaction?	15 16 17	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point on the top of this page? It says, similarly, in American's other two post-deregulation acquisitions,
15 16 17 18	that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might that be relevant to the value of the assets that TWA was expected to bring to the transaction? A Well, as I said, American said that the	15 16 17 18	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point on the top of this page? It says, similarly, in American's other two post-deregulation acquisitions, AirCal and Reno, we've seen American acquire another
15 16 17 18 19	that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might that be relevant to the value of the assets that TWA was expected to bring to the transaction? A Well, as I said, American said that the assets were worth a lot. Number two, on the day the	15 16 17 18 19	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point on the top of this page? It says, similarly, in American's other two post-deregulation acquisitions, AirCal and Reno, we've seen American acquire another carrier and then dispose of the acquired carrier's
15 16 17 18 19 20	that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might that be relevant to the value of the assets that TWA was expected to bring to the transaction? A Well, as I said, American said that the assets were worth a lot. Number two, on the day the acquisition happened, TWA brought, by your numbers,	15 16 17 18 19 20	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point on the top of this page? It says, similarly, in American's other two post-deregulation acquisitions, AirCal and Reno, we've seen American acquire another carrier and then dispose of the acquired carrier's entire fleet. We are, thus, acutely sensitive to
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might that be relevant to the value of the assets that TWA was expected to bring to the transaction? A Well, as I said, American said that the assets were worth a lot. Number two, on the day the acquisition happened, TWA brought, by your numbers, 2300 jobs. If American chooses at that point to	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point on the top of this page? It says, similarly, in American's other two post-deregulation acquisitions, AirCal and Reno, we've seen American acquire another carrier and then dispose of the acquired carrier's entire fleet. We are, thus, acutely sensitive to careful consideration of the value which assets
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might that be relevant to the value of the assets that TWA was expected to bring to the transaction? A Well, as I said, American said that the assets were worth a lot. Number two, on the day the acquisition happened, TWA brought, by your numbers, 2300 jobs. If American chooses at that point to change their structure, it is not clear that it all	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point on the top of this page? It says, similarly, in American's other two post-deregulation acquisitions, AirCal and Reno, we've seen American acquire another carrier and then dispose of the acquired carrier's entire fleet. We are, thus, acutely sensitive to careful consideration of the value which assets truly add to the consolidated operation measuring
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might that be relevant to the value of the assets that TWA was expected to bring to the transaction? A Well, as I said, American said that the assets were worth a lot. Number two, on the day the acquisition happened, TWA brought, by your numbers, 2300 jobs. If American chooses at that point to change their structure, it is not clear that it all comes out of the hide of the TWA folks. It might	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point on the top of this page? It says, similarly, in American's other two post-deregulation acquisitions, AirCal and Reno, we've seen American acquire another carrier and then dispose of the acquired carrier's entire fleet. We are, thus, acutely sensitive to careful consideration of the value which assets truly add to the consolidated operation measuring one side derives a unfair windfall from the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that there were fewer pilot jobs available, might that be relevant to the value of the assets that TWA was expected to bring to the transaction? A Well, as I said, American said that the assets were worth a lot. Number two, on the day the acquisition happened, TWA brought, by your numbers, 2300 jobs. If American chooses at that point to change their structure, it is not clear that it all	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	page 11 of this letter. See the first bullet point on the top of this page? It says, similarly, in American's other two post-deregulation acquisitions, AirCal and Reno, we've seen American acquire another carrier and then dispose of the acquired carrier's entire fleet. We are, thus, acutely sensitive to careful consideration of the value which assets truly add to the consolidated operation measuring

63 (Pages 243 to 246)

	247		249
1	Q Would the position of the APA regarding	1	what aircraft AirCal brought. I unless I it
2	how many pilot jobs it expected the TWA acquisition	2	doesn't appear to me based on what I saw from
3	to result in have any bearing on your analysis of	3	American that they were simply going to buy these
4	the likely seniority integration list?	4	planes to sell them, or sell the gates, or I
5	A Is that related to this bullet point?	5	just it didn't appear that way to me. But even
6	I mean, you read me a bullet point. Are you asking	6	if they were selling them, they were selling them
7	me to respond to the bullet point?	7	for real value. So, I had no I had no reason to
8	Q I think it is related to the bullet	8	change my
9	point, but you can tell me if you disagree.	9	Q Do you know how many of TWA's planes it
10	MR. PRESS: Why don't you start the	10	owned?
11	question over again? Can you read the question	11	A Who? I don't understand the question.
12	back?	12	Q Do you know how many of the planes that
13	(The court reporter read back the	13	TWA flew it had an ownership interest in?
14	pending question as follows:	14	A No.
15	"Question: Would the position of the	15	Q Do you know whether it leased the vast
16	APA regarding how many pilot jobs it expected	16	majority of its planes?
17	the TWA acquisition to result in have any	17	A No.
18	bearing on your analysis of the likely	18	Q Do you know, with respect to the planes
19	seniority integration list?")	19	it owned, what its equity interest was in those
20	MR. PRESS: Note my objection to the	20	planes?
21	form of the question.	21	A No.
22	THE WITNESS: Now, in the analysis I	22	O Do you know of the number of TWA planes
23	do, that does not have a direct effect. It	23	how many American Airlines accepted as part of this
24	I've I concluded that TWA brought value to the	24	transaction?
25	analysis. Based on American documents that showed	25	A No.
	248		250
1	they brought equipment and routes and hubs	1	Q Do you know if it accepted the entirety
2	actually equipment, a hub and gates that American	2	of TWA's fleet?
3	wanted. If American wanted them, they wanted to	3	A No.
4	fill them with planes. Those planes have jobs. And	4	Q Would that make a difference to your
5	as a result, that that's the kind of stuff that	5	analysis?
6	an arbitrator would look at and say, oh, TWA is	6	A As I said, I'm relying on the statement
7	bringing value. Therefore, I'm going to give TWA	7	by American that the planes were of value, along
8	some value for that when I come up with my merged	8	with the gates and the hubs.
9	list. So it is accounted for in my choice of my	9	Q That may be true as to the planes that
10	comparators, indirectly in my choice of comparators.	10	they acquired, but presumably not with respect to
11	Each of them, there is some statement that there is	11	the planes they didn't acquire; correct?
12	something of value that the acquired airline is	12	A I don't know.
13	bringing to the to the merger.	13	Q And would it be potentially relevant to
14	BY MR. TOAL:	14	your analysis how many planes American accepted from
15	Q Well, with respect to the possibility	15	TWA's fleet?
16	that no agreement would be reached between the APA	16	A No. My analysis is not designed in
17	and the TWA MEC, do you consider American's prior	17	that way.
18	experience with the number of jobs brought over from	18	Q And your analysis really doesn't depend
19	acquired airlines to be relevant to the likelihood	19	on anything that happened with respect to the
20	of any agreement being reached?	20	TWA/American Airlines transaction other than your
21	A No.	21	determination that TWA was not in danger of ceasing
22	Q And that's because of what?	22	operations in the near future and your determination
23	A It's simply about I don't know	23	that TWA was bringing assets of value to the
24	enough about those particular previous cases. I	24	transaction; correct?
25	don't know what Aircraft Reno brought. I don't know	25	A Correct.

64 (Pages 247 to 250)

	251		253
1	Q And your analysis disregards the	1	Q Your analysis disregards
2	history of negotiations between American Airlines	2	pre-transaction the direct pre-transaction
3	and the TWA MEC; right?	3	expectations of the TWA pilots; correct?
4	A Between American Airlines or the APA?	4	MR. PRESS: I object to the form of the
5	Q I'm sorry. Your analysis disregards	5	question. Asked and answered.
6	the history of negotiations between the APA and the	6	THE WITNESS: I don't understand that
7	TWA MEC; correct?	7	question.
8	A Correct.	8	BY MR. TOAL:
9	O And other than the determination that	9	Q Well, I thought before previously you
10	you made that TWA was not in danger of ceasing	10	testified that you didn't directly take into
11	operations in the near future, your analysis	11	consideration the pre-transaction expectations of
12	disregards all other information about the TWA	12	the TWA pilots. Is that true?
13	financial condition; correct?	13	MR. PRESS: It's been asked and
14	A Correct.	14	answered five times, I think.
15	Q And your analysis disregards all	15	THE WITNESS: Are you asking me their
16	information concerning American Airlines' financial	16	expectations okay. Let me answer the question.
17	condition; correct?	17	The answer is that's the kind that's the
18	A Yes.	18	kind of thing I take into account indirectly by
19	Q And your analysis disregards the value	19	choosing my set of comparators.
20	of the assets that American Airlines was bringing to	20	BY MR. TOAL:
21	the transaction; correct?	21	Q That's why my question asked if you
22	A No.	22	took it into account directly.
23	Q How does your analysis take into	23	A Well, that's what I meant by directly.
24	account the value of the assets that American	24	Okay. Yes, I did not.
25	Airlines was bringing to the transaction?	25	Q And you did not directly take into
	252		254
1		1	consideration the pre-transaction career
1	A It takes account of them by choosing comparables where other where airlines are	2	expectations of the American Airlines pilots;
2	•	3	correct?
3	bringing things of value to the merger.	4	A Correct.
4	Q Are you thinking about TWA? My	5	VIDEO SPECIALIST: Two minutes, Dan.
5	question involved American Airlines.	6	BY MR. TOAL:
6 7	A Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize. That's	7	Q Your analysis didn't take into
	correct.	8	consideration the status and equipment of pilots in
8	Q It's correct that your analysis	9	either the American Airlines or the TWA groups;
9	disregards the value of the assets	10	correct?
10	A Yes. In answering your original	11	A What I did was I created a tool that
11	question, yes.	12	they could use to do that, but I did not take that
12	Q Let me ask it just so the record is	13	into account.
13	clear.	14	Q And your analysis didn't take into
14	Your analysis disregards the value of assets	15	account any restrictions based on domicile,
15	that American Airlines was bringing to this	16	including the St. Louis fence; correct?
16	transaction; correct?	17	A That's correct.
17	A Correct.	18	Q Did your analysis take into
18	Q Your analysis disregards the	19	consideration the size of the acquiring airline in
19	negotiating position of the APA; correct?	Į.	terms of the number of pilots relative to the size
20	A Yes.	20	
21	Q Your analysis disregards the APA's	21 22	of the acquired airline? A Yes.
22	views concerning whether it was willing to engage in		
23	arbitration of seniority integration disputes;	23	Q In what way?
24 25	correct?	24	A When calculating the the
	A Yes.	25	proportional mean difference, a critical element of

65 (Pages 251 to 254)

	255	
1	that is how big the pilot forces are in the	
2	calculation.	
3	Q Did you try to assess whether	
4	transactions in which the acquiring airline has	
5	multiples of the number of pilots of the acquired	
6	airline, whether the proportional difference in mean	
7	rank is correlated with that difference in size?	
8	A No, I did not.	
9	Q Is that something you would have the	
10	ability to do?	
11	A Crudely.	
12	Q Why crudely?	
13	A Because of the micronumerosity problem,	
14	the fact that there are not many all that many	
15	mergers. I don't know that I can estimate that	
16	relationship very precisely.	
17	MR. TOAL: Off the record.	
18	VIDEO SPECIALIST: The time is now 5:20	
19	and this ends disk number three.	
20	MR. TOAL: Why don't we why don't we	
21 22	break for the day and get back at it tomorrow?	
23	The deposition concluded at 5:20 p.m.	
24		
25		
25		
	256	
1	CERTIFICATION	
2	STATE OF NEW JERSEY	
3	SS.	
4	COUNTY OF GLOUCESTER	
5	I, Jean B. Delaney, a Certified Shorthand	
6	Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New	
7	Jersey, do hereby certify that I reported the	
8	deposition in the above-captioned matter; that the	
9	said witness was duly sworn by me; that the reading and signing of the deposition were waived by said	
11	witness and by counsel for the respective parties;	
12	that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript	
13	of the stenographic notes of testimony taken by me	
14	in the above-captioned matter.	
15	I further certify that I am not an	
16	attorney or counsel for any of the parties, nor a	
17	relative or employee of any attorney or counsel	
18	connected with the action, nor financially	
19	interested in the action.	
20		
21		
22	Ison D. Dolonov. CCD #VIO1556	
22	Jean B. Delaney, CSR #XIO1556	
23	Notary Public #2044912 Exp. 6/19/13	
24	Dated: Innuary 22, 2012	
24 25	Dated: January 23, 2013 DEGNAN&BATEMAN,INC.	

66 (Pages 255 to 256)

	44.4 66.1 170.22	132:1 139:10	actual 122:8 224:1	49:17 50:15 78:24
A	44:4 66:1 170:23		acutely 246:20	86:5 89:9,14,21
abandon 189:19,21	accepted 64:21	141:15 145:8,9,12	add 26:7 190:6	89:22 90:9,15,19
abandoned 190:20	88:6 89:17 115:5	146:3 147:15	246:22	91:5 92:7,19 99:8
abandonment	249:23 250:1,14	148:8 149:4,9,18		99:25 110:4,12
58:13	accepting 85:4	149:18 152:6,24	added 190:4	111:22 117:8
abbreviation 238:8	230:14,16	153:15 156:10	addendum 37:7	122:11 144:21
ability 30:7,20 33:6	access 16:9 73:6,7	157:7 174:5,6	adding 25:18	160:4,10 162:4,15
38:14 39:22 43:8	73:9,12,23 74:17	214:5 216:14	addition 210:24	163:7 174:10
44:16 45:10 52:4	212:24	217:4,17 218:10	additional 7:15	175:8,21 176:3,5
65:10,15,19	account 26:18	218:21 219:3,11	12:16 171:13	179:20 180:10
119:15,17 177:3,6	27:11,24 41:6,23	219:14,16,17	200:2 212:17	182:11 183:2
177:7 217:16	42:1,14 95:18	223:3,5 233:12	adequately 40:8	
218:8,19 255:10	103:3 105:24	236:15 246:19	89:5 123:8 181:9	185:16,20 186:17
able 9:7 12:17	106:14 111:18,24	248:12,19 250:10	227:3,6,9,20,22	186:23 202:6,11
15:21,25 16:21	113:18 118:17	254:21 255:5	228:3 231:11,13	206:25 227:23 236:25 237:2
19:23,23 20:6,7	123:5 141:25	acquiring 34:1	adjust 61:4 112:14	230:25 237:2
62:5 70:16,24	152:2 155:1	65:9,14 130:24	adopt 57:19,22	agreed 17:10 32:17
73:19 74:17 77:24	158:23 191:8	131:6 141:15	adopted 70:7 94:25	0
77:24 78:18	212:18 213:7,22	144:25 145:10	adopting 221:8	86:4,20 87:5 88:14 90:5 119:4
107:25 117:10	214:4,14 215:8,24	153:7 214:5	advance 200:9	148:25 173:12
132:1 136:19,22	217:3 219:2	216:24 217:4,7,9	advantage 112:15	
137:5 144:12,15	237:20 238:2	217:17 218:5,9,20	152:24 181:15	agreeing 86:13,14
144:18,19,24	251:24 252:1	219:4,8,20,21,22	220:15	agreement 13:19
197:23,23 209:9	253:18,22 254:13	221:25 222:3,4,5	advantageous	14:7,8,18,19,23
213:17	254:15	222:8,12,24 223:7	181:5	15:17 16:1,22
ably 39:11,11 87:1	accounted 102:7	236:15 244:13	advantages 236:22	22:22 23:4,8,19
abovecaptioned	248:9	254:19 255:4	advice 68:25	24:3,7,21,25
256:8,14	accounting 101:18	acquisition 78:8	advocating 117:4	25:10,12,14,23,24
absence 19:24 20:8	accuracy 213:2,4	93:16 117:24	affect 29:23 38:16	26:6,20 27:13 28:1,8,25 29:11
21:23 29:8 32:22	accurate 54:3	170:13 185:25	39:24 40:18 43:10	29:23 32:6,24
33:9 55:17 63:1,5	226:22	187:24 190:3,5	44:1 50:17 88:20 91:20 92:14 108:5	33:9,19 34:4,9
63:16 94:16 95:23	accurately 99:24	201:1,2,3,4,21		35:4 36:6,7 37:7
129:17 133:15	achieve 100:2	202:1,18 232:14	108:13 109:17 110:4 122:24	38:5 39:16 41:7
134:15 136:12,17	225:22,24	232:15 238:18,20		43:7 45:25 50:10
136:20 137:7,24	achieved 238:13,16	240:4 242:10	140:8,9 166:11	51:11 58:16 59:6
138:11 139:2	acknowledge 55:15	244:20 247:2,17	182:7 185:11,11 186:10,18 204:22	59:16,17,18,22
163:8 180:21	157:5,12 159:13	acquisitions 153:15	225:25 231:6	91:6,18 101:21
191:19 216:2	162:10	166:18 167:17,21	245:9	103:9 117:10,14
absent 17:11 28:1,1	acknowledged	167:23 170:7		117:16 119:12
63:12 64:2 133:11	180:4,8 213:6	246:17 act 11:13 64:13	agenda 162:7 aggregate 23:3,7,7	123:11 146:22
134:3 135:4 136:6	acknowledges		23:11,14 99:4	163:9 169:15
168:20 171:14	161:11	action 1:2 199:11	aggregating 22:21	173:20 179:4,6,18
204:25 217:9	acquire 146:4	201:7,7 202:21,25	aggregating 22:21 ago 126:11,12	180:21 184:22
absolutely 97:16	246:18 250:11	256:18,19	ago 120:11,12 204:18	186:25 191:19
179:19	acquired 75:14	actions 58:15 92:17		194:1,3,4,8,11,21
academic 206:20	77:19 78:6,15	201:19	agree 18:12,14 29:1	194.1,5,4,8,11,21
accept 42:18,20	124:1,21 131:6,19	activity 15:4,5	32:10 35:2,9 43:5	173.13 17/.41
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
860 818 818 A LOD C. A. A. C. SANDON A. S. A.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	CONTROL CONTRO	edermaniament (1997) (Priminiament School) (1997) (Period	udiggijai. Kineboot ii — kineboodoonoonoonaa kaasa kaa

		1	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
226:25 248:16,20	255:4,6	252:15 254:2,9	173:4,5,6,17,21	109:2 110:7 118:5
agreements 143:23	airlines 3:23,24	airplanes 153:5	173:22 174:13	118:24 120:19
146:17 151:7,8	24:2 29:25 30:17	airport 220:25	176:16 177:12,14	125:12 129:17
162:2 189:9	34:1 41:19 48:17	airports 132:7	177:19 180:9	130:7,11,20 131:2
ahead 34:15 192:4	70:5,8,9,18 76:11	148:4 241:6	181:9 182:22	131:15 134:7,9,12
199:4,9	76:13,25 77:19,24	airtran 79:2	193:1 197:23	134:15 135:5
aim 196:12,13	78:6,20,21 83:2	al 1:4 5:5	198:5,12,22 200:3	136:6,13,17,21
air 1:7 5:6 153:19	85:9,10,24 86:8	alexander 1:14	205:6 228:15,20	137:1,8,24 138:11
187:24 188:2	91:3 93:18,24	alienate 160:24	228:22,23,23	138:20 139:3
208:14	98:21 100:19	allegation 64:16	230:9,10,11	141:6 142:1 150:5
aircal 246:18 249:1	101:2,4 102:2	226:13	alpa7 178:24	150:9 155:13
aircraft 113:8	108:19 110:7	allegations 63:25	alpas 40:6,23 44:5	158:6,7,25 163:9
139:22 166:24	115:2 116:16	88:7 230:9,14	56:16 58:14 63:13	168:20 169:2,11
169:4 248:25	118:5,25 120:20	alleged 11:13 15:23	215:19 227:2	170:18 171:1,6,14
249:1	123:25 124:1	16:25 17:11 32:23	229:25	172:7,19 178:15
airline 18:17 30:17	125:12 129:17	88:5,15,23,24	alternative 19:6,15	180:7 183:10
45:25 65:10,14	130:8,12 131:15	229:20	21:6,12,18,22	185:24 186:6,15
70:14 77:19 78:14	134:16 136:6,13	allen 1:18 5:21 27:5	42:4 55:16,22	186:22 187:6,10
78:15 105:18	136:17,21 137:8	44:22 52:10	88:21 89:19	187:23 188:1,17
124:21 125:14	141:7 143:3	allied 15:24 16:23	154:25 182:25	189:7,20 190:23
130:24 131:7,19	144:20 152:24	26:20 27:14 29:12	183:1 198:1	195:9 197:24
132:2,9 134:7	156:7,10,14 163:9	30:6	237:13	198:3,12,23
135:12 137:3	168:20 169:20,21	allow 12:1,1 13:17	alternatives 28:21	199:15,15 200:3
139:10 140:8,16	170:18 171:6,15	14:4,16,22 15:2	28:23 163:2	200:10,12,15,24
141:15 144:23,25	180:8 185:24	15:16 16:7 17:9	ambiguous 72:20	201:1,18,20,21
145:7,8,13,23	186:6,22 187:7,11	112:12 148:16	ambitious 153:23	202:5,10,20,24
146:3 147:15	187:24 188:1,17	allowed 16:12	amenable 179:16	203:1,24 208:13
148:3,8,19 149:18	189:7,20 198:13	149:11 209:8	amend 79:18 80:9	209:8 211:8
149:24 152:6	200:4,11,24 201:1	alpa 2:4,8 5:17,20	118:8 199:6 225:7	213:23 214:9,15
153:7,15,23 157:7	201:19,20,21	15:24 21:24 23:16	amendment 146:21	215:5,15,18 216:1
158:6,7 169:9	202:5,10,24 203:1	23:25 31:5,22,24	189:8	220:20 222:16
171:2 172:3 174:6	203:24 210:4	32:4,8,24 33:15	amendments	224:7 230:10,13
186:15 199:16	211:8 213:23	34:19 35:15,22,25	142:21 143:22	231:1 233:5,11,14
209:14 214:6	214:9,15,25 215:6	38:24 40:7,22	146:16 151:24	237:4 238:21
216:1,14,18,24	215:16 217:12,17	44:9 45:19 46:9	american 24:2	242:7,9,11 244:18
217:4,4,7,8,9,14	217:25 218:21	46:10 47:18 48:10	30:17 34:1 37:9	244:21,24 245:1,2
217:21,23,24	219:12,13,14,20	48:10 51:3,6	41:19 45:25 46:11	246:18 247:25
218:1,5,10 219:4	219:22 220:20	61:11 63:6 66:21	46:17 48:1,17,23	248:2,3 249:3,23
219:4,9,17,17,20	222:3,4,8,16,17	67:2 69:25 70:6,8	49:13 60:15 66:13	250:7,14,20 251:2
220:25,25 221:1,3	222:24 223:3,8	85:19 89:7,20	75:8 78:14,20,25	251:4,16,20,24
221:20,24 222:5	224:7 233:5,14	90:8,14,18 91:8	81:9 83:1 84:14	252:5,15 254:2,9
222:12 223:5	236:1,5 237:4	92:18 93:18,24	85:9,10,24 86:8	americans 93:15
225:9 236:15	238:21 239:9	95:24 115:2	90:25 91:3 98:21	195:8 246:17
239:9,13 240:2,16	241:4 242:7,9,11	120:23 123:7,9	100:18 101:2,4,10	248:17
240:21 242:23	248:19 249:23	129:7 133:8,16	103:20 104:4	americas 2:3
243:9 244:13	250:20 251:2,4,16	134:3 138:15	105:8,18 107:24	amount 57:12
248:12 254:19,21	251:20,25 252:2,5	163:17 172:5,18	107:25 108:19	213:8
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	i Nemoniae de la companyo de la Compa			

				
analogue 162:20	238:24 240:20	182:17 198:25	197:9,13 203:20	191:13 202:7,12
analysis 8:16 16:10	243:7,8,11 244:7	204:18 215:12	247:1,16 248:16	arbitrating 184:4
18:25 26:17 27:10	245:4 247:3,18,22	218:14 253:5,14	251:4,6 252:19	arbitration 7:7
27:25 28:6 29:24	247:25 250:5,14	answering 163:23	apas 31:13 49:3,11	28:4 29:23 32:8,9
31:17 38:17 39:5	250:16,18 251:1,5	231:18 252:10	51:22 119:24	32:11,12 33:16
39:6,7,14,24	251:11,15,19,23	anticipated 174:15	120:7,18,24 121:9	34:3,10,23 35:5
40:18 42:1,15,21	252:8,14,18,21	anybody 149:15	121:25 122:7	35:19 39:17 40:5
43:11 44:2 49:21	253:1 254:7,14,18	anymore 219:13	123:1,5 182:2	41:20 44:12 46:10
50:4,17 51:20	analyst 79:11	221:14	184:3 186:18	46:19,20 48:13,18
52:6,25 54:17	analytic 212:11	anyway 153:9	252:21	49:3,18,22 50:16
58:1 60:8,22	analytical 212:1	241:25	apologize 82:24	51:7,12,13,17,18
62:13,17,18 75:3	analyze 93:15	apa 23:20 30:11,14	252:6	51:23 69:17 74:7
75:9,23 76:2	164:7 197:8 211:7	30:20 31:8,11,24	apparently 202:18	74:9,11 85:25
78:12 81:15,24	211:17 226:17	32:9,17,22 33:6	202:19,20 241:16	89:22 90:22,24
83:7 88:18 89:18	234:4 243:16	33:12 34:24,25	appear 114:2	91:5,10,24 92:6
91:20 92:14 94:20	analyzed 167:5	35:11,15,17,25	145:15 148:6	92:16 102:24
96:20 101:21	200:17 231:19	36:4,23 37:15	190:18 249:2,5	116:7 127:19
108:5,13 109:6,17	announce 5:13	38:14 39:1,7,21	appearances 5:14	141:10 142:9,20
109:22 112:2,4	answer 12:11 14:9	40:10,14,21,24	appears 6:16	146:14,21 150:15
113:2,13 114:7,9	14:13 17:6 20:25	41:7,15 42:15,25	appendix 68:13	151:6,8,22 159:14
114:12,12 117:15	21:3,10 26:3,15	43:8,18,25 44:4	72:22 142:25	159:25 160:4,5,7
118:2,22 122:7,13	26:15,25 27:18	44:15 45:9,19,24	151:3	160:8,15,17 161:7
122:20 124:10,17	34:16,18 43:15,17	46:24 47:1,7,10	applicable 70:3	161:22 162:9,21
128:21,24 131:14	46:1 50:21 70:11	47:15,16 48:10	approach 64:15	162:25 163:6,20
133:5,20,21	73:12 79:18 81:12	49:16,21 50:2	112:14	163:25 164:5
134:19 136:23	82:18 83:7 94:2	51:4,15 52:2,3,23	approached 44:3	169:13 172:1,8,15
139:4 141:24	99:13 106:8 116:8	52:24 59:7 60:5	appropriate 59:4	172:20 173:3,8,13
143:8,20 148:24	118:9 120:21	60:23 61:2 65:19	59:11,14 62:13,17	173:16,18,19,25
149:2 150:17	121:19 122:4	66:2,10,10,17,24	96:5 99:5 196:22	174:7,8,11,14,20
152:6 154:9	138:3,6 145:6	74:8,8 85:6,7 86:3	217:2 229:7 232:2	174:21 175:9,15
158:18,19 159:3	154:5,6 155:6	86:9,13,20 87:5	232:7,23 233:18	175:19,22,23
163:22 166:11	173:15 179:7,18	88:22 89:9,14,16	april 24:1 232:16	176:24 177:8,15
168:16 170:14	179:20,22,23	89:21 90:9,14,18	232:19,20 233:1,1	179:5,16,21
176:22 177:4,22	180:1,13 184:5,9	92:18 94:10,14	233:6	180:10,20 181:16
182:7,15 185:12	186:12 189:18,22	98:19 101:23	arbitrary 97:10	182:3,11,22,23
187:6 190:12,21	199:6,25 200:6	103:11 117:20	arbitrate 31:13	183:2 184:8,20
190:25 191:6	201:2,5 209:25	119:4,11,18	32:18 33:14,21	185:6,17,21
202:2,23 203:5,11	210:2 214:17	120:22 121:13	43:5 50:2 52:3	186:24 187:8
203:16,20,25	222:21 224:17	122:5,11,14,22	86:5,14 89:9	189:14 190:22,24
204:9 205:10	225:7 231:2	123:10 132:23	198:17	191:2,3,18,23,24
208:24 209:2,3,12	233:18 234:3	133:15 163:8	arbitrated 28:9	192:1,8,24 193:2
211:15 214:14	237:20 244:5	173:8,12 174:16	29:10 36:3,19	193:14,17 194:12
215:8 216:22	253:16,17	178:15 179:15,17	42:5 59:21 61:5	194:15,22,22,25
217:6 218:3 219:8	answered 40:1 49:6	179:22 180:10,21	62:22 64:24 149:1	196:23 198:16,19
220:16 222:20	52:8 77:4,11 83:4	181:4 182:2,11	159:18 161:9,13	206:23 212:6
224:19 225:25	118:7 119:7	184:9,21 185:16	161:21 163:12,13	214:24 218:25
226:7,10 231:6,24	124:13 138:1	185:20 186:11	164:11,13 177:1	220:19,23 234:15

F T				
234:16,22 235:1,4	ashenfelter 72:6	assessed 140:25	34:21 35:7 46:21	availability 74:20
252:23	127:6	assessing 54:2	46:23 66:23 67:1	209:4
arbitrations 43:19	ashfelter 1:13	62:25 141:11	67:2 136:23	available 7:1,3
61:22 116:17	ashmore 1:13 72:6	assessment 132:21	163:17 199:19	15:19 43:3,10
118:17 150:17	72:7 102:11 127:6	133:2,3,13,19,22	assumption 35:6	102:15 103:6
162:12 176:5,9,19	128:10 148:23	134:1	38:21 39:23 46:22	112:14 145:24
196:3,8 197:4	asked 8:22,23,25	asset 45:25 131:24	56:14 60:12,25	146:5 147:17
214:11 215:14	8:25 9:3 10:6,15	134:7	67:6 86:1,7 98:11	148:9,20 163:25
234:5	18:11 19:10 40:20	assets 24:2 34:2	129:6 163:21	209:5,10 213:20
arbitrator 29:2	49:5 70:15 73:17	130:11,15 131:3,7	217:6 230:3	244:15
38:4,4 115:24	77:4,11 93:15,22	131:16,19,25	231:12	avenue 2:3,6
116:3,23 148:2	102:12 114:13	137:3 148:8,19	assumptions 98:9	average 60:10,17
162:4 194:23	119:6 124:13	149:4,9 152:8,8	98:10,14 128:21	61:13 67:4,5,8,11
207:16 235:19	126:24 129:12,15	157:7 167:11	129:2,4,12,15,19	67:17 85:21,22
236:14 248:6	129:19 132:17	185:25 222:11,16	130:10,13 132:17	86:24 89:4 94:20
arbitrators 69:19	135:24 138:1,14	223:1,9 225:4	132:25	116:19 123:20
69:22 70:7,12	139:15 173:24	239:24 240:1,5,25	assure 111:6	154:18,18,19
116:10,12 141:11	180:8 182:16	241:3,8 242:2,17	asymmetric 15:12	160:25 161:19
142:9 146:15	184:2 198:24	244:8,16,19	atkins 166:18	195:24 196:2
151:25 152:11	199:3 204:8	245:10 246:21	atlantic 216:17,18	averse 161:18,25
160:18 175:5	215:11 218:13	250:23 251:20,24	attached 167:6	aversion 161:16
192:10 193:10,15	226:11 228:18,19	252:9,14	attempt 8:18 10:4	avoid 51:16
193:18,19 194:17	253:5,13,21	assign 114:3	19:14 152:14	award 7:7 74:3
196:12,16,18,20	asking 8:8 10:8,24	assigned 58:12	210:9 211:7	160:7
196:25 197:5,7	12:4 21:21 24:10	113:8	attempted 111:23	awards 69:17 74:7
205:25 206:15,24	24:18,19 29:16	assigning 58:11	attempting 19:5	74:9,12 102:24
206:25 207:5,14	39:20 43:13 49:23	assignment 114:16	attention 22:10,15	127:19 151:8
207:18,19 208:2,6	50:13,14 52:1	126:20 130:2	37:20 53:9 93:9	164:5 172:1 175:9
208:7 210:8 211:1	59:12 63:18 73:12	assignments	104:25 129:24	207:22 214:24
213:6 216:4,10,12	74:22 82:19,20	112:24 233:2	130:3,6 165:20	aware 11:25 13:8
219:2 220:21	107:7 122:3,18	assistance 142:18	178:18 183:21,25	13:16 14:3,15,21
221:9,11 222:2	133:1 137:21	associated 213:12	188:25 236:9	15:2 16:6 17:9,14
237:22	199:20 200:18	association 1:7 5:6	246:14	28:24 36:21 80:19
archer 1:14	204:3,4,14 205:1	15:25 16:23 26:21	attorney 128:11,12	81:4 91:16 92:17
area 15:6	214:13 215:4	27:15 29:12 30:7	256:16,17	107:4 115:5 139:9
argued 125:10	216:6,7 221:23	184:13	attorneys 1:20,23	140:11 145:21
135:7 230:11	227:17 228:17	assume 39:20	2:4,8 73:19 74:11	149:17 168:13
argument 188:20	237:25 239:2	43:18 45:18 47:6	113:15 126:17,17	170:9 177:8
arithmetic 58:23	240:24 247:6	50:13,14 52:1	128:2,9 233:20	180:16 184:16
arose 201:4	253:15	67:7 73:16 76:8	attributable 174:12	185:19 201:18,25
array 164:4	asks 191:6,7,10	100:25 109:9	auction 137:1	229:1 230:21
arrive 58:21	226:10	232:18 233:4	168:6	awful 166:23
article 127:23	assess 65:8 84:12	assumed 27:3	authority 38:22	176:18
135:6 138:7	131:18 132:1	29:18,19 66:11	40:11 241:5	
170:11 208:8	148:18 217:16	217:5	authorized 23:25	<u>B</u>
articles 147:1	218:20 222:10,15	assumes 35:1	automatically	b757 105:5
articulate 8:9	242:16 255:3	assuming 28:6	158:23	b767 96:11
		_		
	•	-	-	

b767200 105:5	based 3:11 10:1	15:21 16:20 59:24	153:5 239:25	213:11,13,16
b767300 105:5	17:25 19:5 53:2,7	65:2 70:3 90:18	241:23 255:1	boutique 161:5
back 20:4 22:14	57:8,15 60:8 61:4	94:13 102:3,9	bigger 99:1 153:9	boy 222:7
26:23 27:6,8	76:11 94:13 96:16	112:20,25 119:14	153:21	brady 1:4 5:5
43:22 45:7 52:22	98:17 137:17	119:15,16,18,22	billion 53:18,25	breach 15:23 16:25
58:18 66:16 67:12	155:14 208:2,4	121:23 122:1	54:14 57:2 170:5	17:11 19:25 20:8
84:25 85:16 98:23	209:2,3,10 217:17	125:25 131:9	binding 179:5,16	21:24 26:19 27:12
99:1 120:4 121:25	247:25 249:2	143:5 146:7,19	180:10	28:7 29:9 32:23
161:19 162:15	254:15	148:21 166:21	bit 55:9 67:23,24	55:18 63:1,6,13
165:2 167:1	basic 147:13	173:23 174:19	83:15 98:3 103:16	63:16,24 69:12
181:23 193:25	basically 24:10	178:3 182:6,19,19	120:3 161:20	87:21 88:1,15
247:12,13 255:21	51:19 60:9 69:6	187:1 193:13	192:6 198:9	94:16 95:23
background 69:5,6	72:9 114:12	206:20 210:20	202:17	133:15 134:3
71:4 82:12 230:17	137:13 140:16	235:5 241:2,13,21	blanking 128:10	174:13 227:13
backgrounds 230:7	153:5 181:14	believed 31:8,11	block 96:9	228:7,12 229:10
backup 151:2,15	212:13 241:19	182:20	bloom 206:21	229:11,15,16,20
178:5 206:21	basis 54:2 63:18	believes 183:2	board 184:12 207:1	229:25 230:1,22
bad 11:13 64:13	67:13 86:18,23,24	benchmarks 54:19	bodies 107:16	231:5,8
128:18 133:12	87:3 94:19 121:8	benefits 111:7	113:25	breached 129:7
balance 237:24	121:10 138:9	best 19:15 20:1,10	boeing 166:23,25	break 84:18 85:3
balancing 236:22	150:22 159:9	21:17 39:13 53:15	bond 79:15	181:25 217:22
240:15	172:10 227:10	64:7 67:24 69:14	book 180:3	220:10 221:12
bandied 95:13	228:5,14 229:2	71:10 82:6 86:19	bottom 6:18 56:12	255:21
bankrupt 134:24	238:13,17	87:4 91:1 95:1,22	58:9 97:4,7,15,23	breakdown 220:1
bankruptcy 74:25	basket 223:5	100:1 105:24	99:20 100:15	breakdowns
75:4 79:6,9,13,16	bateman 2:9 5:8,9	106:3 118:3,22	105:1 112:9,22	216:21
79:21,22 80:1,6	bear 88:18 198:12	119:4 126:8	119:13,20 142:18	breakfast 80:23
80:13,17 82:6,14	198:22 200:3	147:24 160:25	149:19 154:3	brief 84:23 181:21
82:16,19 83:10	bearing 168:18	198:1 213:19	155:12,12 156:5	bring 131:3 198:12
91:17 92:7 121:17	170:14,16 180:25	226:6,22	156:20 167:25	220:15 243:10,20
122:2 124:18	184:19 190:12	bets 164:1	189:5 208:22	243:24,25 244:17
125:4 134:9,15,25	247:3,18	better 12:12 90:10	209:14 210:5	245:15
137:1,20 166:15	beginning 127:16	90:15 92:20	225:10,11,13,14	bringing 52:21
169:18,20,22	230:25	133:22 153:12	225:19,23,23	131:7,20 132:2
bargaining 15:9	behalf 5:16 34:20	154:20 195:20	231:4 238:11	147:15 148:3
34:4,9 39:16	41:22	231:20	bought 137:3	175:12 222:12,17
40:13 44:10,11	behaved 173:6	beyond 78:10	boulevard 1:18	222:25 223:5,7,9
48:11,15 91:6,18	behavior 47:18	242:15	bound 21:14 53:25	225:4 241:9
94:13 119:12	64:1,16 133:12	bid 104:6 105:19	54:6,8,10,22,25	242:17 244:8,11
120:23,24,25,25	192:10 204:25	107:25,25 109:4	55:4,19,23 56:23	244:11 248:7,13
121:2 133:5,10,14	205:5 227:17	109:15 140:17,18	56:25 57:1,5,8,9	250:23 251:20,25
133:23 134:1	228:22	140:24 166:16	57:10,13,16,20	252:3,15
143:23 146:17,22	behaviors 64:23	170:24	68:11,11 213:13	brings 157:8
160:9 173:19	belief 94:19,23	bidding 109:16	213:13	240:16 241:3
186:18,25 187:14	beliefs 122:18	bids 108:5,13	bounds 19:19 21:8	245:1,6
189:9 198:7	185:11	big 40:8 97:23,24	21:17 22:1,5	broad 140:6 204:17
base 128:21 139:19	believe 9:6 12:15	98:25 116:18	53:21 55:11 68:5	broke 113:20
		NACES NACES AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE STREET, AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE ST		

	1		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
brought 130:15	54:17 60:13 232:2	career 118:5,12,17	176:9 178:17	223:12 231:20
144:25 145:7,8	232:8,23 254:24	118:19,24 129:20	185:10 188:23,24	232:4,14,19
148:9,19 149:5,10	calculation 3:10	129:24 130:3,7	195:7 196:7 203:5	cease 121:4,21
152:8 192:17	53:1,7 57:7,15,20	139:19 142:4,6,10	203:8,15 205:9,18	129:16 135:12
198:22 200:3	59:2 149:13	157:18 211:1	208:15 213:16	136:7
221:20 224:20	155:21 233:21	214:14,21,22	223:5,11 232:3	ceased 217:13
235:20 240:21	255:2	215:9 216:1,12	237:14	ceasing 122:2,23
241:16,16 244:20	calculations 54:3	221:16 223:12,16	cases 12:14 37:1	250:21 251:10
247:24 248:1,18	68:4 149:14	224:2,18,21,23	38:9 54:18 55:2	central 139:25
248:25 249:1	calculator 155:20	234:6 237:24,25	60:10,17 61:14,15	ceo 200:23 203:10
brundage 3:19	call 54:13 55:1	240:15 254:1	61:20,21 62:4	203:23
183:7,9,13	137:14,14 153:15	careful 73:5 246:21	65:8,14 67:5	certain 64:22 101:5
build 25:4 207:15	153:17 198:6	carefully 110:23	69:14 70:8 74:15	175:17 216:10
building 96:9	213:9 220:5	111:16 154:7	75:16 86:25 89:3	certainly 57:4
built 103:14	called 72:6 156:13	carl 125:18,20	89:4 94:21 104:4	62:22 77:13 107:5
bullet 246:15 247:5	193:25 229:25	135:2 167:6	117:14 123:16,18	109:6 126:10
247:6,7,8	calling 81:18	carrier 75:14 149:4	144:17 146:1	150:21 181:14
bump 103:21	camden 1:2 5:7	149:9 153:8,9	147:10,12 156:25	235:5
business 3:15 11:12	cant 8:9 12:11 14:9	236:19,20 246:19	161:1,2 172:12	certified 1:15 5:9
125:9 153:11	14:13 21:4,10	carriers 235:19	174:5 194:9,11	5:10 256:5
165:3,15 171:14	22:2 24:15 26:15	236:11 246:19	196:10 207:22	certify 256:7,15
241:4	31:25 32:2,10	carry 240:25	211:23 214:20,20	cetera 58:24 67:22
busy 241:5	33:19,20 40:9	carty 3:21 180:4,5	216:11 235:6	69:9,9 139:21
butfor 151:24	43:17 55:21,25	187:20 188:9,12	239:7 248:24	150:1
225:11,16 229:3	59:10 60:20	188:16 200:23	cash 135:8,20	cfo 203:10
buy 153:24 167:11	102:15,20 106:9	case 6:12,21,24	137:18 166:19	chairman 188:17
171:2 249:3	106:23 109:3	9:24 11:3,5,8,11	171:9	246:5
buying 171:8 222:9	113:3,10 117:12	11:13 12:10,18,21	categorical 221:7	chance 58:15 61:15
buyout 171:1	141:22 147:12	13:10 15:8,24	categorically	chances 197:3
	151:19 154:11	16:21 17:16 18:20	205:14	change 42:21 52:5
<u>C</u>	158:14 186:12	18:23 19:16,20	categories 145:17	76:8 77:7 101:15
cabin 139:20	187:13,21 193:22	21:6 29:8 30:6,11	220:11,24 221:11	244:22 249:8
calculate 8:25 18:4	195:22 206:25	30:20 36:22 37:9	222:1	changed 114:6
19:18 60:19 62:1	215:21 221:15	44:18 45:13,21	categorized 139:10	changes 245:13
62:5 70:24 77:17	222:6 228:21	55:8,9 60:9 61:23	category 78:7	characteristic
77:25 116:24	235:6 239:6	65:18 67:16 69:10	113:20 158:8	157:21
144:12,15,18	241:14	73:10 74:19 80:16	causality 160:1	characterize
145:4 148:16	capital 83:23	80:21 81:5 87:8	caused 56:17 76:24	144:23
149:11 235:24	captain 105:5,10	92:23 93:1,4,7	cavanaugh 206:21	characterized
calculated 17:25	105:19 111:4,5	99:12 117:22	cbas 142:21 151:25	170:5
22:8 26:2,13,14	139:20 184:10,10	118:21 119:3,23	cc 37:3,6,14 48:6,8	chart 22:20 78:18
53:25 58:6 59:1	245:22,22 246:3,8	125:4 130:22	90:10,15,20 92:20	144:10
72:16 111:20	246:10	132:14 141:2	100:15,18,24	check 151:10
calculates 9:23	captains 107:18	144:3 146:23	101:1 103:14	checks 87:10
53:17	114:1,4	147:21,25 152:20	104:1,8,15 105:4	cherrypick 158:15
calculating 11:20	capture 212:11	160:19,20 163:24	110:12,20 111:2	chief 80:20 81:4
12:13 17:20,22	care 211:15	172:17 173:1,11	127:25 210:15	choice 97:10,12,21
			A SOUTH OF THE PROPERTY OF THE	

<u> </u>				
97:23 248:9,10	coaching 52:15	comment 24:10	compensation 99:5	48:19,24,25 75:7
choices 18:15 97:25	coherent 212:1,20	commentary	99:24	75:14,18,18 76:14
212:11	coin 160:16	165:14 166:10	competing 108:3	80:12,16 82:5,13
choose 40:15	colleague 5:17	168:1	108:12,18,25	82:21 83:1,17
140:17,18,22,24	collecting 72:15	committed 122:22	competition 108:16	84:13 91:4 120:19
235:22	collective 34:4,9	common 63:21	complaint 69:8	121:15 122:9,19
chooses 244:21	39:16 91:6,18	commonly 64:21	74:2	123:6,25 124:10
choosing 75:13	119:11 143:23	210:8	complete 99:11	129:13 134:9
118:12 140:23	146:17,22 173:19	company 84:13	187:2 234:17	144:20,23 145:23
237:21 252:1	186:24 189:9	157:22 190:4	completed 232:16	146:3 148:7,18
253:19	column 38:3	240:16	completely 110:16	149:3,8 157:6
chose 95:15 98:4	combination 59:20	comparable 54:23	complex 10:7	175:12 216:23
170:22	93:18,24 115:2	60:10,17 61:15,20	complicated	217:3,16 218:9,20
circumstance	211:13	61:21 65:5,21	146:11	219:3,8,24 222:3
50:25 184:7	combinations	66:13,15 67:18	component 11:17	222:6 224:19
circumstances	172:3 212:7	69:14 75:13,15	11:20 142:3	236:14 251:13,17
13:18 14:6,12	combine 25:7	79:1 85:22 86:25	224:23	conditional 140:14
49:17 150:8	combined 217:8,13	89:3,4 98:5	compute 209:10	conduct 177:3
cite 234:13	225:9 240:16	118:15 131:13	conceive 180:9	conducted 93:6
cited 125:5	243:17,21,24	159:9 191:9,10,12	200:2	conducting 133:19
civil 1:2 160:8	244:1	192:21 205:3	conceptually	confine 199:25
claim 7:19 148:13	come 20:2,10,14,21	212:21 214:3,20	105:23	confining 150:17
claiming 121:2,20	20:24 21:16,23	225:21 226:12	concerned 99:4	confusing 24:9
class 7:19,25 8:5,19	22:14 28:17,21	235:11,16	190:2 196:21	congressional 81:7
9:4 93:1 99:6,22	29:22 32:1 33:3	comparables 62:6	197:1 219:12	81:10
99:25	34:22 35:10 36:9	62:21 76:4,9,25	concerning 18:22	conjecture 228:17
clause 32:8 33:12	36:14 38:11 39:1	77:8,14 118:13	62:11 79:12 80:12	228:18
33:16 39:8,8,9	54:15 57:9 66:16	124:7 130:18	80:16 81:8 93:4	connected 256:18
51:7,12,13 169:13	69:11 86:3,13	139:8 159:4 174:4	122:8,19 123:5	connection 6:24
173:4,8,16,19	89:20 96:7 97:6	177:17 192:21	132:19,24 135:2	68:16 126:20
174:1 181:4	98:2,13 99:1	195:24 196:4	146:2 147:1 149:3	197:14
clear 41:9 57:6	109:21 114:7,9	217:11 218:4	149:8 165:16	consensually 43:7
68:19 95:2 108:17	123:9 162:5,5	222:11 237:21	167:18,20 174:21	conservative 56:13
111:13 115:19	171:19,23 175:6	252:2	175:23 179:7	97:8,11,13 98:6
169:14 184:6,9	181:8 195:13	comparator 234:5	187:6 189:9 219:1	225:15
211:16 244:22,25	211:23 213:19	234:10	224:1 251:16	consider 42:4
252:13	220:22 225:17	comparators	252:22	72:22 95:15 102:6
clearer 210:3	228:19 234:2	248:10,10 253:19	conclude 208:25	117:23 152:5,12
clearly 146:16	237:12 244:24	compare 78:21	concluded 137:15	153:13 154:4,6
200:15	248:8	240:4	247:24 255:22	168:21,24 193:4
clicked 166:5	comes 63:23	compared 78:14	concludes 84:22	196:22 210:8
closed 200:1	158:19 244:23	216:3	conclusion 56:5	211:14 222:19
232:20	coming 41:18	comparing 64:15	225:3	224:19 225:7
closer 46:16	45:23 47:15	115:15	conclusions 130:13	235:15 242:4
closing 178:6	147:21 245:8,9,10	comparison 115:14	130:14	243:23 244:2
clvs 2:9	245:11,12	115:15 127:21	concrete 90:24	248:17
coach 44:23	commencing 1:16	compel 162:9	condition 34:1	consideration
	_			

116:5 118:11	178:1	65:22 66:15,25	24:15 71:9 107:1	customers 201:12
141:11,13,18	continental 79:1	68:6 74:23,23	159:6 188:6 244:2	cut 160:23
143:21,25 152:15	153:19,19,21,24	79:6,7 84:10,11	counsel 5:13 10:16	cutoff 143:7
216:23 219:7	154:2	88:8 89:9,11,15	74:7,8,8 93:14,22	
221:24 237:12	contingencies	89:17 90:11 94:3	128:24 179:12	D
243:14 246:21	167:6	95:24 96:14,15	233:24 234:1	damage 29:24
253:11 254:1,8,19	continue 46:18,21	99:9,17 100:8,13	256:11,16,17	44:18 45:13 99:2
considerations	76:15 95:12 111:6	106:3,25 112:5,6	count 117:12	108:5 109:17,22
144:14 243:12	134:23 136:24	115:3,22,23	counteroffers	110:6 111:19
considered 12:5	171:10 217:7,8,10	117:18 119:21	120:4	damages 3:11 7:18
42:10 70:1 75:13	217:21 218:2	121:16 124:2,3,7	county 256:4	7:24 8:4,15,18 9:1
144:2,10 145:15	239:14	124:8,23 132:14	couple 178:6	9:3,23 10:4 11:4,8
151:1,12 156:15	continued 46:12,13	132:16 137:10	course 75:18	11:21 12:10,14,18
177:25 240:15	211:11 226:24	138:24 139:13	128:23 226:5,20	17:20,22,24 18:5
242:6	continuing 146:10	142:1,2,14,25	court 1:1 5:7,7,10	19:5 22:8 29:7
considering 36:16	continuous 220:7	143:6 145:18,24	5:25 20:4 27:8	45:21 53:2,7,18
69:23 138:13	220:14 221:6	149:5 150:17	45:7 91:17 92:7	53:25 54:17,25
193:5	239:4	151:14 152:9,10	129:8 201:8	56:10,17,19 97:9
consistent 105:13	continuum 219:23	152:12 155:9	227:14 229:10	97:21 98:7,9,12
111:11 188:19	220:1,2	156:2 159:10	247:13	99:22 111:23
consolidated	contract 31:2,3	161:13 163:22	courts 201:9	115:16 232:3,8,24
246:22	32:8 33:7,12,16	174:19,23,24,25	227:16	233:21
constant 210:9	39:2,8,9,10 49:13	175:13 178:2,3	cover 168:10	dammit 153:24
construct 97:2,17	66:3 119:17,19	180:17,18 182:7	coverage 80:12	dan 5:15 10:23
98:1,23 99:7	120:2 169:13	187:19 191:14	create 91:1 95:17	164:19 254:5
154:24	173:4,17,22 180:2	194:5,8,12 196:5	158:21 241:4,4,7	dance 230:25
constructed 42:11	181:4 198:18	196:12,17,23	created 77:12	danger 250:21
142:13	contribute 243:17	197:4 213:24	219:25 254:11	251:10
constructing 95:16	convert 60:19	214:6,10 215:2	creating 58:16	daniel 2:2,6 5:18
130:8 152:16	converted 57:11	216:11 219:24,25	240:22	darrah 3:18 178:8
construction	convince 123:10	220:3 223:10,14	creation 60:4	178:10,12,14
224:15	convinced 51:6	224:24,25 225:5,6	creditors 169:3,19	184:10
consult 82:15 83:18	copy 3:12 6:11 13:2	233:13 235:13	171:4	darrahs 182:10
83:25	87:11,15,18	236:15 240:9	criteria 124:20	dartmouth 127:24
consulting 71:8	104:20 178:16	241:1 250:11,24	217:17,20 218:10	data 15:19 112:10
contacts 184:11	188:11	250:25 251:7,8,13	234:19	112:15,18,19
contain 6:20 68:15	core 127:17	251:14,17,21	criterion 130:17,17	113:1,6 151:23
144:10 175:9	correct 18:21 19:16	252:7,8,16,17,19	157:20 235:23	164:16,17 177:5,6
234:22 235:1	19:21 21:14,19	252:24 253:3	critical 254:25	207:10 211:22
contains 53:6 77:21	32:18,19,25 33:1	254:3,4,10,16,17	criticism 98:8	212:13,16,20
contemplate 7:3	33:9 34:25 39:18	256:12	crude 75:17 220:1	213:3,20 220:10
contemporaneous	42:6,17,19 47:3	correctly 87:10	crudely 255:11,12	date 1:16 221:23
80:11	48:1,20 55:19,23	126:4	csr 256:22	231:10,16 238:4
context 16:20	55:25 56:23 57:2	correlated 207:19	current 6:23,25 7:8	dated 3:25 104:15
17:15 115:21	57:5,17,21,24	255:7	7:9 205:19 239:18	245:16,21 256:24
116:25 117:5	58:3,4 61:22 63:7	cost 15:13	239:21	david 72:6 102:11
162:11 175:25	63:8 64:25 65:6,7	couldnt 21:10	curry 230:13	128:9 148:23

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	I
day 4:2 44:11 96:24	declared 82:13	deserve 221:22,24	141:22 151:11	177:21 209:11,15
101:10 128:2	declaring 121:17	designated 53:22	217:1	209:21 210:6
156:4,18 163:19	defendant 1:8 2:4,8	designates 38:7	develop 12:17	235:24 250:4
169:21 217:13	5:5,16,20	designed 98:11	131:18 136:1	254:25 255:6,7
230:24 242:25	defending 170:23	250:16	218:19	differences 20:18
244:19 245:17,23	define 12:12	desirable 241:6	developed 21:13	64:18 95:14,18
246:3,8 255:21	defined 26:13	despite 111:8	159:12	115:11 116:1
days 9:19 71:12,13	defines 22:22	192:24	didnt 27:3 33:14	139:12 141:14,25
71:14,14,17 72:2	definitely 190:23	detail 83:23 102:20	34:14 35:9 49:13	143:17 157:25
72:2,2 127:1	definition 36:5	detailed 83:25	54:15 66:19 73:4	161:12
179:6	180:2,3	details 235:18	73:13,13,18 76:1	different 13:18
daytoday 72:9,14	degnan 5:9	determinate	77:5 80:8 89:7	14:6,12,13 16:13
dc10 216:17	delaney 1:15 5:11	139:25	92:1,11 97:17	16:16 40:25 41:3
dc10s 216:18	256:5,22	determinates 140:3	101:5,24,25	47:9 50:12 51:4
de 221:16	delay 24:1	140:11	102:13,21 112:18	55:9 56:10 80:10
dead 220:12	deliberations 152:1	determination	112:23 113:1	83:16 90:4,10
deal 91:4 134:9,15	delta 58:12,13	78:19 85:5 88:20	124:12 125:15	107:12 119:17
157:4 168:20	146:20 164:15	250:21,22 251:9	127:25 132:13	124:4,7 155:25
195:16 232:20,20	235:3	determinations	144:17 147:11	156:17 157:4
dealing 161:23	deny 60:3	52:1 76:10 234:23	149:7 158:9 159:7	159:15 177:1
deals 199:15	departed 94:24	determine 11:23	159:8 164:17	183:23 185:8
dealt 184:11	depend 15:12	12:1 14:5,23 17:9	168:24 169:15,23	212:8 214:11,12
debtorinpossession	190:22 250:18	19:1 24:23 26:5	170:3,23 171:1,9	214:25 215:1,1
125:13	depending 109:1	30:21 31:9 33:7	172:21 185:2,8,11	220:10 240:24
decade 238:17	depends 15:13	36:10 38:15 39:22	185:11 193:4	differentially
december 104:15	62:21 131:23	42:16 43:8 44:16	199:1 204:7 205:1	161:18
decide 29:2 30:7	197:22 209:16,18	45:10 52:4 60:5	211:20,22 219:19	differentiate 159:8
47:7 113:15 162:5	209:18	60:23 65:10,15,19	220:1 224:22	differently 139:8
204:6	deposed 80:20 81:5	82:4,21 85:7	228:23 229:17	173:6
decided 35:17	deposition 1:13	118:3,22 124:25	239:21 244:2	difficult 182:24
47:21,22,25	3:17,20 5:3	135:3,12 140:17	249:5 250:11	211:24
146:19 160:3,4	127:12 128:3	176:23 205:11	253:10 254:7,14	dig 205:22
172:8,14,20 173:8	178:11,17 188:8	208:21 209:9	differ 162:11	diligently 230:23
191:1 219:7	188:12 246:13	218:8,23 241:9	163:12	dimensions 154:12
225:10 227:14	255:22 256:8,10	determined 35:18	difference 46:25	diminished 223:23
decides 160:11	deregulation 38:1	36:4 37:10,14	49:20 50:3 62:1	dinner 14:20
decision 35:11	derive 120:7	38:10 62:16 65:5	63:25 64:1,1,3,18	dire 120:25,25
36:22 70:14	derived 45:24 48:8	66:14 73:22 75:20	68:5 71:1 77:18	121:3,14,20
113:14 142:22	59:15 96:4	76:22 87:21	77:22,23 78:13,20	direct 22:10,15
152:3 174:11	derives 246:23	123:21 138:25	97:1 115:21	37:20 53:9 70:19
234:15,16,22	describe 143:20	190:5 225:20,24	116:10,19,21,24	93:9 104:24
235:1,4 236:7,10	222:2	229:3	117:5 141:5	118:11 129:4
236:13,18 238:5,8	described 41:11	determines 108:15	144:13,16 145:4	142:15 165:20
decisions 141:10	114:15 175:14	140:19 194:21	148:17 149:2,12	178:18 183:21,25
142:9,21 151:22	192:7	determining 24:5	149:15 153:2	188:25 236:9
175:23 177:1	describing 41:10	43:3 99:5,23	155:9 158:6	246:14 247:23
219:1 220:22	46:16 152:1	106:14 117:21	161:11 164:9	253:2
				MARKET STORY OF STORY

			- · · · ·	
directed 129:6	disputes 15:11	doing 9:9 10:16	85:16,17,25 86:1	230:22 231:2,2,14
direction 68:22	34:10 39:18 117:6	64:14 67:21 72:16	86:6,9,9 88:3,4,6	231:16,17 232:12
72:10 233:23	117:9 177:9	109:5 115:6	90:16 91:11 92:1	232:14,17 233:22
directions 160:1	206:24 207:11	123:14 147:22	92:2,11 96:8,19	234:19 235:6
directly 70:3	208:3 252:23	160:11 190:4	96:19 101:11	238:19 239:19
211:14,18 224:22	disputing 15:13	196:14,17 212:13	102:12,15 103:24	240:6 244:3,10
253:10,22,23,25	disregards 251:1,5	216:19 219:20	104:2,7,7,22	245:14 246:1
directors 184:13	251:12,15,19	222:8 227:22,24	106:1 109:5	247:10 248:23,25
disadvantage	252:9,14,18,21	227:24	110:10,18,20	248:25 249:11
219:11 223:2	253:1	dollar 8:4,25 57:11	111:13 112:2,23	250:12 253:6
disagree 66:10	disruption 201:12	57:13 60:19	112:24 114:6	255:15,20,20
100:3 227:23	distinction 102:25	dollars 7:20,25	116:8 117:13,17	doublecheck 65:3
247:9	103:1	57:2,9,10	121:10 122:5,14	doubt 187:10
disagreeing 176:7	distinctions 76:21	domestic 242:23	126:4,7,12,13,21	drafted 170:10
disbelieved 182:10	distress 217:24	domicile 95:19	127:5 128:12	draw 130:14
disclosed 201:21	218:2,5	103:13 105:6,20	131:11 135:17	drawing 223:25
discount 59:4,14	district 1:1,1 5:7	108:1,11 109:11	136:3,10 137:13	drew 130:13
60:20 61:19	document 3:15,22	114:10 157:24	138:17 139:14,15	driven 212:14
discounting 58:20	6:13 53:5,10 56:6	254:15	146:17 148:5	drop 51:6 55:3
60:2	68:20 69:24 70:2	domiciled 107:14	149:14 150:1,10	due 40:6 99:24
discover 208:12	87:14,18 104:16	109:24	150:15,23,24	168:10 201:20
discriminated 64:7	104:25 111:1	dominant 132:11	151:18 154:22	duking 162:18
64:9	147:13 150:15	161:7 192:19	155:21 159:3	duly 6:2 256:9
discrimination	151:10 165:3,8,9	don 3:20 187:20	160:4,10 162:4,21	duties 112:10,18
64:5,13	165:13 172:16,25	188:9,12,16	162:23,23 163:5	113:6
discursive 98:16	173:2,3 183:16	dont 8:18 10:9	164:13,21 165:11	duty 11:14 15:23
discuss 233:25	188:13 235:25	14:11 19:13 21:11	166:22 167:1,12	16:25 17:12 19:25
discussed 94:9	236:4 245:25	22:24,25,25 23:6	167:23 169:23	20:8 21:24 26:19
113:15 193:9	246:7	23:9,13,13 24:14	170:25 177:5,7	27:12 28:2,7 29:9
213:3	documents 68:16	25:20 30:1,24	178:3,5 181:6,8	31:22 32:23 35:22
discussing 94:25	69:7 71:3,7 72:19	32:5,13 33:10,11	181:12 182:19	38:25 40:22 44:9
discussion 69:20	72:21,23 73:6,10	35:12,12,13,13	183:20,23 185:3	51:3 55:18 61:12
95:13 169:12	73:21,23 74:1,16	37:11,11,18 38:12	186:16 187:4,16	63:2,6,13,16,24
discussions 85:8	74:22 80:8 127:21	38:20 40:9 41:4	188:4,4,24 190:20	67:2 69:12 74:4,5
180:5 184:6 221:8	144:16 173:11	42:14,18 43:16,24	191:20 193:17	85:19 87:22 88:1
disk 255:19	188:6 234:13	46:11,12 47:19	194:20 195:15,18	88:15 93:19,25
dismiss 96:6	247:25	48:5,6,7,13,15,21	198:3,5,8,14,19	94:17 115:3 129:7
disparity 116:15	doesnt 39:3 51:21	50:23 51:8,14,17	199:6,12,13	133:9 138:15
dispose 246:19	52:16 61:3 100:18	55:8,12 57:12,12	202:15,16,17,19	172:5,18 174:13
dispute 15:15 38:8	101:15 116:8	57:13,19,25 61:17	202:21 203:7	176:16 215:19,19
43:6 47:20 48:3	145:15 150:14	61:19 62:7,7	207:3,24,25 209:1	215:20 226:15
89:10 115:12,22	160:24 181:14	65:17 66:1,6	212:6 213:11	227:13,15 228:7
115:25 116:4	190:18,21 191:7	73:11,11,16,20,21	216:8 217:10,15	228:12,15,20,24
117:1 160:3 161:7	195:16 196:1	74:21 75:6 76:1	217:23 220:13,14	229:11,11,17,20
191:8 192:22	213:21 216:22	76:17,19 78:10	220:15 221:2,6,22	229:25 230:1
193:4 201:6	228:2 249:2	80:2,3,9 81:20	222:7 227:4,4	231:5,9
202:18	250:18	82:18 83:12 84:19	228:11,13 229:7	dying 217:12
	•			-

100	offusively 122.4	entirety 250:1	61:19 63:12 67:25	example 15:4 64:4
<u>E</u>	effusively 122:4	entitled 22:17	67:25 68:2 69:11	66:17 73:20
earlier 21:3 126:25	eight 24:4 25:13	236:4		107:13 125:11
170:3 190:1 214:1	37:25 47:20 71:14	1	71:10 86:20 87:4	
246:12	88:23 93:12	entity 243:17,21,24	93:16,22,25 94:7	132:3,10 140:9
earliest 232:6,22	114:15,20,21	244:1	95:1,22 100:1	146:20 147:6
early 126:13,15	126:10 179:2	enumerate 42:8	105:24 106:3	148:2 153:18,20
192:7 230:18	180:12	environment 175:3	112:13 114:25	158:1 206:19
earn 64:5,6 67:19	either 24:22 28:8	175:11	118:3,22 119:4	examples 209:22
67:20,23	29:4,10,22 34:23	equal 67:8 245:11	126:22 127:9	exception 155:11
earned 64:12 67:20	38:4 43:23 64:8	equipment 95:6,15	204:24 213:19,21	excluding 60:22
238:22	75:21 76:11 77:1	95:19 101:5,9,16	225:15 226:6,22	85:3,6,14 158:7
earnings 11:15,17	77:8,19 78:15	101:19 102:1,3,7	228:19 237:13	exclusively 100:18
140:1,4,8,9,12	86:4,13 89:21	102:18 103:8	255:15	excuse 30:9 100:9
easily 97:6 181:6	121:1 123:9	111:25 112:25	estimated 56:15	executive 80:20
east 1:22	139:11 155:18	113:19,22 114:10	215:25	exhaust 148:6,11
economic 115:6	160:10 163:7	126:1 132:4,5,5	estimates 57:16	exhaustive 148:12
175:3,11 176:21	174:6 218:9	140:18 148:4	estimating 151:23	exhibit 104:19
economics 13:17	226:14,14 239:22	153:11 157:23,25	estimation 213:9	151:14
14:4,16 15:7,10	240:8 254:9	158:3,3,9,22,24	et 1:4 5:5 58:24	exhibit1 6:14 68:13
16:7 63:22,22	element 254:25	159:5,10 211:13	67:21 69:9,9	93:11 165:22
234:2	eliminate 245:2	215:1 216:20	139:21 150:1	exhibit10 236:6
economist 15:5	emerged 59:25	221:21 241:6,16	evaluate 242:19	exhibit11 245:21
82:12 83:23,24	empirical 206:10	241:17,18 248:1,2	evaluated 236:14	exhibit2 13:2 22:11
135:7 197:19	206:17,19 208:1,9	254:8	evaluating 93:14	37:21 56:7 143:11
204:23 217:15	employee 256:17	equitable 91:1	116:12	exhibit3 53:6 68:9
218:8,18	employees 117:25	160:22 175:7	event 29:21 41:5,10	exhibit4 87:15
economists 64:20	169:5,7	206:2 207:23	41:11,22 56:2	exhibit5 104:13
72:11,13 198:6	employing 56:15	equity 249:19	90:7 92:5 155:23	exhibit6 165:8
233:22	enable 102:2	error 213:9,10	179:16 184:20	exhibit7 178:16
ed 4:1 245:17,22	211:23	esquire 1:18,21 2:2	186:22 187:7	exhibit8 183:17
edict 67:25	enabled 114:8	2:2,6	231:10	exhibit9 188:11
effect 34:5 56:14	enables 245:1	essence 194:3	events 23:12 24:20	exhibitb 68:15
98:5 111:5 175:6	encompassing	213:14	25:8 29:4 231:17	exhibits 242:9
176:17 212:8	189:13	essentially 54:20	evidence 36:25	exist 133:11
232:19 247:23	ended 201:5,6	95:3 96:4 101:17	46:3 48:22 172:17	
effectively 108:11	endorse 57:23	113:17 135:25	173:1,2,11	existence 86:3,13
193:20 196:9	ends 164:24 255:19	153:8 154:16	exact 207:3	exp 256:23
233:7	enforcing 48:24	173:24 175:5	exactly 31:21,25	expanded 192:5
effects 64:22	engage 49:22 66:4	213:19 222:24	39:5 42:8 63:11	expanding 236:20
effort 18:4 23:3	182:2 252:22	239:3	68:1 71:9 98:1,2	expansive 212:25
146:4 197:8	engaged 202:21	established 67:12	99:21 102:22	213:1
211:17 222:10,15	engagement 71:20	230:21	109:25 122:5	expect 28:14 67:15
242:1	enjoy 111:6	estimate 19:15 20:1	125:10 174:1	67:15,16,19 83:8
efforts 91:1 132:13	entered 134:8,14	20:10 21:17 28:4	187:19 195:22	107:14 118:18
148:6,11,12,13,14	entertain 184:7	28:5 53:15 54:7	202:17 244:11	122:24 159:17
148:17 155:1	entire 184:13 230:5	54:14 56:21 57:9	examined 6:3	162:1 163:11,16
208:12,17,18	246:20	57:10,14,16 61:18	237:10	163:24 176:12

		·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
191:22 210:21	exposure 224:22	75:12 95:5 152:5	falls 56:23	109:6,24,25
217:21	express 58:2	152:12,15 157:6	familiar 24:4 25:1	111:12,15,19,25
expectation 61:14	138:10	157:11 192:19	187:21,23	254:16
216:16	expressing 7:17	210:9 211:9,14	far 88:9 114:13	fences 111:5
expectations 118:5	29:3 32:16,20	212:9,17 213:7	120:5 126:19	fewer 220:12
118:12,17,19,24	35:19 36:2,12	237:23 243:13	farber 1:13 3:3,11	244:15
129:20,25 130:4,7	121:14 187:17	facts 52:6 181:3	5:4 6:2,6,13 13:1	field 14:4,16,24
142:4,6,11 157:18	223:11	234:10	22:10 37:20 53:2	16:7
211:2,3 213:22,24	extensive 198:6	factual 228:5,14	53:6,14 56:7 68:9	fields 15:18
214:4,15,21,22	extent 65:18 132:6	230:4,8	68:13 85:2 87:15	fight 195:5
215:9 216:13,19	extract 151:13	fail 162:15 194:8	93:10 104:13	fighters 195:3
221:16 223:13,16	212:21	194:11	143:11 165:7,8,21	figure 22:17,24
223:20 224:2,18	extracted 101:14	failed 31:22 44:9	178:16 181:25	37:25 47:20 53:10
224:21,23 234:6	113:24	88:23	183:16 188:11	57:17,18 58:10,20
237:25 238:1	extreme 55:2,3	failing 28:2	236:6 245:21	60:20 61:4 70:16
253:3,11,16 254:2	148:11	failure 11:14 28:1	farber1 3:8 6:8	102:22 106:20
expected 76:15		40:7,8 44:5	112:8	109:23 116:20
77:1,9,20 78:8,16	F	215:19,20 227:3	farber10 3:22	144:19 195:4
101:7 125:1 156:1	faber3 3:10	229:25	235:25	204:24 234:18
160:7 162:11	fact 6:15 34:8	fair 11:14 15:23	farber11 3:25	239:8
186:10 217:18	38:14 39:5,21	16:25 17:12 19:25	245:16	figures 111:19
218:2,11 243:17	42:2 46:8,11	20:8 21:24 26:19	farber2 3:9 12:24	figuring 11:17
243:20,24 244:17	47:22 52:2 66:17	27:13 28:2,7 29:9	farber3 53:1	file 151:17 169:20
247:2,16	89:8,13 96:7,22	31:22 32:23 35:23	farber4 3:12 87:11	filed 5:6 79:22
expenses 135:21	97:11 98:10,12	38:25 40:22 44:9	farber5 3:13 104:9	91:16 92:4,13
experience 12:9,13	100:15 101:9	51:3 55:18 61:12	farber6 3:15 165:3	134:25
187:24 248:18	107:18 111:15	63:2,6,13,16,24	farber7 3:17	filing 75:5 79:21
expert 3:8 6:8,12	119:4 131:15	67:3 69:12 74:4,5	178:11	83:10 169:18
6:15 13:9 16:15	133:8 137:17	85:20 87:22 88:1	farber8 3:19	filings 74:24 79:6,9
17:15 34:21 63:4	146:7 148:24	88:15 91:1 93:19	183:13	124:18
63:15 72:9 115:20	152:20 162:1	93:25 94:17 115:3	farber9 3:20 188:8	fill 212:23 248:4
119:3 137:6,14,22	164:14 169:6	118:15 129:7	fare 191:11	finances 84:6
138:21 165:21	173:3 175:15	133:9 138:15	favor 70:14 230:13	financial 75:7,14
204:23	208:4 215:13,13	160:22 164:2	favorable 90:19	75:17,18 76:14
expertise 62:25	223:22,25 225:7,7	172:18 174:13	150:23 190:19	80:12,16 81:5
84:12 106:5,11,16	228:14,16,23,24	175:6 176:16	221:18	82:5,12,21 83:1
131:22 132:8	233:19 255:14	192:11 206:2	feature 207:9	83:17 84:1,13
135:11,25 136:1,3	factfinder 51:25	207:23 215:20	federal 142:22	120:19 121:3,15
experts 13:14	factor 62:24 106:24	219:15 226:15	feel 69:9	122:8,15,19 123:6
explain 27:21	112:13 116:4	227:13,15 228:1,7	fellow 137:18	123:25 124:5,10
192:6	139:18 141:10,17	228:12,15,21	felt 74:19 103:4	129:13 135:20
explaining 242:9	141:19,23 142:14	229:11,21 230:1	131:6 154:15	144:20,23 145:23
explanation 155:22	168:16 236:22	231:5,9	155:24 235:19	146:2 147:8 148:7
explicitly 210:18	240:14	fairly 44 :6 69:19	fence 95:6 103:15	148:18 149:3,8
explore 147:16	factored 20:19 95:2	103:17,18 176:2,2	104:1 105:14,23	154:16 157:6
exposed 224:7,11	factors 62:22 69:22	201:5 216:13	106:13,24 107:10	175:11 214:23
exposes 225:12	70:1,7,13,19,20	fall 78:6 175:16,18	107:11 108:3,10	216:23 217:3,16
	• ************************************			

	,			
217:20,24 218:2,5	flights 107:14	follows 6:3 20:5	176:15 228:15	200:17
218:9,20 219:3,8	108:24 233:11	27:9 45:8 247:14	229:10	garrison 2:1 5:16
219:24 222:3,5	242:25	foolish 205:16	four 72:13 93:10	gates 132:9 148:4
224:19 236:11,14	flip 84:17 164:20	footnote 102:4	156:7,8 207:6	241:5,13,14,20,20
239:5 251:13,16	flow 135:20 171:9	112:9,21 165:21	framed 27:25	241:20,21 248:2
financially 134:8	flown 137:4	166:2 235:6	framework 95:17	249:4 250:8
256:18	flush 103:21	forced 168:19	101:17	general 10:12 11:2
financing 125:13	fly 46:13,21 76:20	forces 192:16 255:1	framing 245:14	11:3,9,10 152:17
126:2 171:19	77:2,9 101:5	foregoing 256:12	frank 153:22	157:1 192:10
find 51:1 62:10	134:23 136:24	foreseeable 76:15	frankly 9:18 83:10	195:13
64:8,10 69:7	137:16 146:10	76:18,20	120:22 156:3	generally 73:24
74:14 75:16 84:8	169:21 171:11	forget 40:13,14	163:18 185:4	115:5 155:8
125:6,6 130:18	flying 3:22 75:21	forgot 128:13	220:16 221:8	171:22 211:1
146:23 150:18	75:22 76:12,12,14	form 8:6,10 9:10	freight 235:19	222:25
151:19 154:10	76:15 77:1,8,20	10:5,14,20,22	frequently 117:16	generate 93:16
155:22 208:18	77:20 78:7,8,15	12:3 16:2 17:3	117:17	114:25
218:3	78:16 83:9,10,12	24:9 25:2 26:9	front 22:12 188:6	generis 66:22
finding 115:14	101:10 121:16	27:2,16 28:13	frontier 79:1	getting 196:22
227:16	122:2 124:15,16	29:14 31:21 34:12	152:22 153:4,11	197:3 230:9
findings 69:2	124:21,23 125:1	37:16 39:25 41:14	156:13,14,14	gingerly 156:16
fine 101:13 147:22	129:16 134:8	42:23 44:19 45:1	157:3,3 158:2,2	give 33:18 39:3
finish 77:5 95:12	135:4,13 139:11	45:14 46:2 50:19	fruition 171:19,23	48:12 51:14,15,18
finished 23:21	139:11 149:25	52:7,14,19 58:11	frustrated 74:20	55:11 69:1,19
firm 5:11,19 72:5,7	152:7,7 153:5,6,9	65:24 77:10 81:16	full 33:10,11 102:2	71:3 73:19 87:20
104:2 167:10,11	158:8 162:23	81:17 83:3,19	113:2 124:16	98:25 106:25
first 11:11 47:24	168:19,22 169:23	99:10 109:18	170:2 171:6	138:9 143:21,25
56:12 69:5 101:24	169:25 171:6	110:8,15 137:25	fully 101:7 113:19	146:17 181:6,11
103:2 106:7 111:3	211:11 216:16,18	140:5 186:2 192:2	function 50:25	193:20,22 195:18
114:5,5,7 126:5	217:19,21 218:3,6	193:4 197:16	fundamentally	198:8 213:11
139:20 160:2	218:11 219:13	198:6,25 212:23	144:2 164:1	221:15,17,18
168:25,25 170:2	220:11 221:1,12	224:5 228:9 237:5	furlough 211:4	248:7
172:4 183:3	221:12,14,22	237:16 239:15	furloughing 169:5	given 9:7 11:23
198:14 236:17	225:2 233:10	247:21 253:4	furloughs 105:8	82:11 94:5 97:18
246:15	235:12,21,21,25	formal 155:3	139:23 224:8,11	97:18 122:11
fiscal 218:5 219:18	236:4 239:14,24	175:14	224:20,23 225:8,8	135:13 158:18
fisher 105:7	243:9	former 203:23	225:13	175:10 213:20
five 23:20 25:10	focal 160:5 161:22	forming 102:6	further 7:8 9:24	224:16
58:13 139:17	195:5	forms 212:24	114:9,11 167:8	gives 39:2 41:15
207:2 253:14	focus 142:10	formulated 8:11	234:20 256:15	43:25 96:25
fixed 135:21	154:17	forsyth 1:18	future 76:16,18,20	101:18 152:23
flag 157:2	focused 133:25	forth 120:4	125:11 168:20	giving 45:24 46:24
flawed 43:14	focuses 175:18	forward 123:13	218:12 250:22	48:12 67:24 70:11
fleet 246:20 250:2	folks 244:23,24	173:25 228:17	251:11	120:9 225:14
250:15	follow 48:20	found 51:4 68:24		237:19
flew 249:13	followed 229:20	74:4 87:25 88:5	<u>G</u>	globally 158:17
flies 139:22,22	following 168:11	129:8 150:13,20	gain 198:6,7,7	gloucester 256:4
flight 154:16 233:2	210:24	150:24 166:12,14	game 194:19	go 9:9 14:20 34:15
	I NASANDA OTO SEE TA TALAHA AA			

F				
51:16,17 58:18	192:13,15,18	groups 85:22	227:21,25 228:3	207:21 208:6
67:12 73:24 84:5	193:23,24 194:24	142:11 161:23	228:20 232:15,25	243:3
84:19 98:23	195:4,8,9,10,10	176:3 177:10	244:20 250:19	highway 1:22
105:22 112:19	195:11,12,13,14	195:8,25 196:2,6	happens 176:20	hire 105:7 221:23
114:13 121:25	195:18 198:17,19	196:7 198:16	194:20 198:8	hired 105:8 169:7
124:12,17 133:18	212:12 216:7	206:1,6,8 209:19	245:13	197:3
143:13 146:23	217:7,8 221:17,18	211:2 214:21	happy 155:22	hiring 215:1
147:12 152:21	223:3 225:2	254:9	204:2	history 94:13 96:16
155:7,7,23 160:10	227:25 230:18	guess 153:21 155:5	hard 16:18 31:20	96:21 97:18 98:18
160:13,14 164:21	237:3 242:10	156:13	39:12 73:2 98:3	125:3,3,4 190:7
167:1 173:5,7,25	248:7 249:3	guilty 74:4	103:12 185:3	200:25 201:25
177:14,14 181:16	good 6:6,7 45:2	gunty 74.4 guy 99:1 127:24	205:12 211:21	229:2 239:18
181:18 186:7	100:4 147:19	153:23	harder 132:7	251:2,6
192:3 195:2,16	148:4 154:1	guys 147:21 153:11	hasnt 12:5 159:2	hit 69:13
199:4,9 201:8	166:20 205:4	162:18 221:14	havent 19:9 21:11	hold 105:9 112:21
235:5	222:5,25 223:8	102.10 221.14	26:13 56:2 58:23	166:16 175:20
goal 160:18,19	google 84:5	Н	78:11 83:4,13	195:17 205:22
goals 193:20	gotten 60:18 127:2	haddonfield 1:22	84:7 106:2 110:22	home 139:19
god 40:14,24,24	171:13	hadnt 18:20	110:22,23 112:4	honest 48:5 56:1
41:11,15,18 43:22	govern 195:21	half 128:2 174:24	117:15 139:14	126:12 151:9
43:23,24,25 45:23	grammar 94:5	halpern 2:9	204:4 230:7	231:7
46:24 47:1,10,11	grammatically	hammer 175:16	237:10	honestly 43:16 62:7
47:15 52:22,24	94:3	hand 76:13 132:22	head 183:9 235:7	66:6 78:9 82:17
66:17,17 126:12	great 171:9	132:23 165:7	heading 56:9,13	82:18 122:3
153:24 162:15	greater 22:3 213:2	211:4	105:1 168:5	127:10 155:20
goes 101:14 199:15	213:4	handful 212:9	236:11	hope 150:19
going 5:12 6:11,13	green 1:17 180:3	hang 195:10,12	healthy 217:14	horribly 24:11
10:21 15:8 16:17	greiner 1:14	happen 86:17	218:1 220:11,11	host 152:12
18:4 34:11 36:11	grossest 127:9	160:13,14 162:14	220:25 236:20	hours 71:9,15,15
40:5 43:12 45:3	ground 33:18	175:10 181:12	heap 101:12	71:15 140:21
51:14 53:12 66:16	160:23	195:10,12	hear 92:1,11	hub 199:18 241:12
67:12 69:11,20	grounded 149:25	happened 11:12	206:16	242:5,12 248:2
76:18 79:22 87:14	221:15	28:5 40:21 60:9,9	heard 150:13	hubs 241:5 248:1
90:23 100:1 101:7	grounding 76:23	60:16 61:13,13,20	heat 169:11	250:8
113:24 121:4,21	group 76:24 77:8	63:1,5,10,12,15	heck 66:18	huge 152:23
124:22 128:14,17	77:13 78:5 85:22	64:2 67:4,16,17	help 27:7 71:3	hundred 174:1
131:3 137:16	115:14,16 117:25	67:18 69:12,16	72:20 126:18	hung 193:1
140:16 147:23	127:21 162:22	86:25 89:6 100:12	helpful 81:15,23	hypo 50:22
148:13 153:24	166:18 167:17,18	118:15 123:15,16	henry 1:13 3:3 5:4	hypothetical 25:3
154:8 156:20	167:21,22,24	124:21 136:12,16	6:2	40:2,4,13 41:12
160:3,20 162:1,2	170:7,13 199:21	137:7,23 138:10	heres 30:4	42:24 43:2 45:18
162:3,3,4,18	210:5,17 215:5,6	138:19 159:2	hes 10:25 39:25	46:15 50:20,23
165:7 169:15,24	224:11 225:22	166:4 182:25	138:1	51:9 52:23 61:11
171:10 175:16,18	226:14 227:18,19	185:2,14 191:10	hesitating 165:19	65:25 66:7 99:11
175:19,20,20	234:7 236:23	201:10 204:25	hide 244:23,24	99:14 185:2,14
173:19,20,20	grouped 77:25	213:16,18 225:15	highest 170:24	190:17 205:1
189:25 190:6	grouping 139:15	226:11,11,16	highly 207:17,20	231:15 239:16
109.23 190.0	grouping 199.19		Highly 207.17,20	251.15 257.10
			l	
8888000 80000 CV VVIII VAID CO.	s-vervennesser 1655156.25.11. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	AND		

	1 00 0 00 10 10 00	. 450.14	200.11	101.25 25 102.5 8
hypotheticals	80:9 82:19,19,20	impact 58:14	209:11	101:25,25 102:5,8
43:13 200:18	83:23,24 85:18	111:19,24 182:15	includes 64:24	102:18,21 103:5,7
	87:14 90:1 91:14	201:14 243:13	including 127:18	103:8 106:17,18
125.10.20.20	94:2 101:6 106:19	impacts 201:12,13	127:23 152:2	106:20,23 107:1,2
ichan 125:18,20,20	108:17,17 113:2	implement 60:6	200:25 254:16	107:4,23 112:13
135:2 167:6 171:2	113:10 122:18	163:10	inclusion 62:17,18	113:9,12 120:6
id 72:19 84:5,5	123:14 128:10,13	implemented 61:2	income 19:1,7	122:15,17 123:10
103:12	128:18 135:14,25	164:3 232:4	141:1 223:17,21	135:1 142:19
idea 31:11 38:11	136:23,24 137:9	implications	224:2	143:3 144:17
51:19 60:8 81:10	137:13,21 138:13	202:25	incomplete 40:2	145:3,3,16,22
84:3 88:4 111:21	138:23 145:12,21	implicit 96:2	43:13 50:19 65:25	146:2,4,16,24
127:8 141:8	146:8,9 148:13,13	138:17 142:16	inconclusion 62:13	147:8,13,16 148:7
158:10 171:1	151:17 159:7	157:17 217:6	incorporated	148:16 149:3,8,10
184:8 237:7,9	162:1 163:23,23	224:18	211:12	151:14 167:17,20
identification 6:9	165:7,19 169:17	implicitly 211:15	incorrect 213:25	168:13 171:12
12:25 53:3 87:12	170:21,21 173:25	237:20 238:1	increase 24:21	172:4 175:10
104:11 165:5	174:19 176:7,8,18	imply 176:11	increased 11:23	185:15 186:21
178:12 183:14	178:16 182:23	importance 58:12	22:22 23:4,8,18	209:4,6,8,10
188:9 236:2	185:4,6,12 188:5	important 9:22	24:3,6,24 25:9,12	234:17,18,22
245:18	192:23,23,25	11:17,20 19:4,12	25:22,24 26:2	235:2,8 251:12,16
identified 86:19	193:18,25 199:19	68:24 69:24 96:8	independent 25:8	informative 185:13
174:3 177:17	199:19 200:16,16	96:9 99:6 111:24	26:7 47:17 124:9	inquiries 18:7
196:4 235:11	200:19 204:1,2,12	112:3 122:6,13,20	124:17 234:9,12	insight 87:20
identify 87:4 131:5	204:21 205:12	123:4 127:22,23	234:14 246:7	insist 119:11,19
ill 54:13 98:25	213:4 214:13	139:18 148:4	indicate 47:21	insisted 23:16
183:16 241:15	215:4 216:6 220:4	157:25 202:23	indication 133:11	instance 23:16
illegal 64:16	221:8,17,17	212:11 220:21	144:25	96:13 203:10
illustrate 55:6	227:15,16,20	225:8,10 236:22	indirectly 74:10	234:15
im 5:4,9,18 6:11,13	229:22 230:2,16	237:11	214:4,19 248:10	instances 143:22
10:21,23 13:22	230:16,20 231:12	impose 42:25 44:1	253:18	194:7 234:25
15:4 16:17 21:21	233:17,17,20	44:4 45:20 52:23	individual 18:14	instruct 129:1
24:18,18,19 28:24	240:23 242:12,14	66:2,10 162:16	industry 18:18	instruction 69:1
33:1,10,22 34:11	248:7 250:6 251:5	237:23	37:1 67:21 132:9	integrated 50:11
35:6 36:15,16	252:6	imposed 62:23	inferences 223:24	111:9 112:11
39:20 40:5 43:12	imagine 7:6 64:4	imposition 36:16	infinite 97:3	117:21 208:19
44:8,25,25 46:20	84:6 142:7 158:20	37:2 43:21 61:16	influence 58:11	integration 3:14
46:20,23,23,23	199:12,13 200:20	impossible 181:16	157:8,12	16:1,24 17:11
47:4 50:13,13,14	200:20 212:22	improper 239:16	influenced 161:15	18:23 29:11,13
51:6 52:1,12 56:1	immediately	inappropriate	190:25 227:12	30:8,22 31:14
57:12 59:12 60:7	168:22 239:11	229:6,8	228:6	32:18 33:8 34:4
60:11,11,11,13,18	imminent 76:23	include 142:20	influences 139:19	34:10 36:23 38:9
60:25 61:9,10,18	125:15	144:6,17 208:23	influential 200:16	38:16 39:17,22
63:21,21 64:14	imminently 75:22	209:1,3,6 211:3	informally 220:5	41:21 43:4 47:8
66:16,16 67:1,1,5	76:12,18 77:1,9	219:13	information 7:1,2,5	48:19 49:4,11,18
67:11,12,24 70:11	77:20 78:8,16	included 124:1	15:12 47:23 62:11	50:3,16 52:3
72:9 73:8 74:10	121:4,21 124:23	131:13 145:5	62:15 69:15 70:23	55:17 60:24 85:5
75:5 78:10 79:20	125:1 225:3	159:4 206:21	71:3 72:15 87:25	85:8 86:12 89:11

r				
91:25 92:7,19	investigate 174:4	215:6,7 256:24	218:6 237:19	104:4 106:1 107:5
104:10,14 105:25	investigation 150:7	jean 1:15 5:11	kept 125:14 137:4	107:13,20,22,24
115:12,22,25	167:8	256:5,22	key 125:11 239:10	110:10,18,20
116:4,25 117:6,9	involve 215:14	jeff 3:19 183:7,13	kill 169:15	111:17 112:3
117:11 119:25	involved 72:13	jei 1:2	kind 48:11 103:14	113:1,7 117:13
120:8 132:19,24	107:6 156:7	jersey 1:1,14,15,16	113:8 192:22	121:10 124:16
141:12,20,23	191:13 214:8	1:22 5:3,7 207:2	195:5 204:20	125:11 126:7,21
143:4,24 148:25	235:12 252:5	256:2,7	212:13 213:11	127:5 128:18,18
150:8 157:9	involves 106:7	jet 166:17	233:19 248:5	128:18 134:12,14
159:19,20 163:15	involving 149:24	jets 153:6	253:17,18	135:17,19,20
173:13 174:12,22	188:18 194:13	jfk 132:9 241:13,20	kinds 107:16 221:8	136:10 137:12,13
175:24 176:25	202:1 220:19	241:23,24	kings 1:22	139:14,15 143:17
177:9 179:7,18	irrelevant 109:3	jim 5:8	knew 38:13 49:21	148:3,3,22 150:11
180:6,11 182:3,12	205:16 222:19	job 100:4 104:6	49:23,24 50:1	151:9 153:13,22
184:5,22 185:17	isnt 64:17 89:18	160:25 163:17	181:3,4,5,5	154:22 155:17
185:21 188:3	96:6 123:17,17	236:19	know 14:12 17:21	156:3 157:2,3,15
189:15 191:1	130:22 142:3	jobs 64:11 136:22	17:24 18:3 19:4	157:16,19,19
194:10,14 199:18	160:16 161:15	137:4 236:19	19:12,13 21:1,10	159:3 162:3
202:7,12 208:13	175:19 220:20	240:22 241:1,3,4	21:11 22:7,25	163:24 164:2
211:8 217:2 219:1	isolate 212:8	241:7 243:16,20	23:1,6,9,10 24:14	165:9 166:4,13,17
220:19 224:15	isolation 24:22	243:23 244:3,11	25:4,7,13,16,20	166:19,21,22
229:19 237:14,22	158:13	244:15,21 245:1,2	26:1,11,12 30:11	167:10,12,13,23
240:20 246:24	issue 8:8 9:21 10:7	245:7,11,13,15	32:5,13 37:3,11	168:25 169:4,15
247:4,19 252:23	103:13 157:23	247:2,16 248:4,18	37:12,18 38:12	169:17,18 171:5
intend 6:21	158:3,4 187:18	john 3:17 178:8,12	39:12 40:10 41:4	173:23 175:1,2,4
intent 48:24 189:18	233:24 234:1	jointly 90:4	42:23 43:17 44:12	175:12,17 177:17
interest 121:6	245:7	joke 170:6,14	46:11,12 47:12,14	178:8 179:10
199:14 249:13,19	issues 95:14 201:4	judge 16:12 45:4	47:16,17 48:6,7,8	181:6,7,8,9,10,12
interested 18:3	ive 9:12 15:3,6,8	160:10 170:2,22	48:11,13,14,15,21	181:14 183:4,7
99:23 134:22	43:24 55:24 59:10	judges 80:5 160:17	49:14 50:23 51:14	185:5,23 186:5,16
146:9,9 219:10	64:19 75:4,4	170:12	51:20 54:24 55:5	187:13,16,20
230:9 256:19	82:16 87:9 88:12	judgment 123:24	55:6 57:25 61:17	188:1,4,13,22,24
interesting 127:23	91:14 104:22	124:4	62:6,7,7 64:6,19	190:20 191:16,20
153:20 156:18	113:23 115:16,17	julie 2:2 5:17	65:13 69:4,8,22	195:23,25 196:9
158:10 161:6	117:12 126:25,25	july 3:25 245:16,21	70:11,17 71:14	198:3,5,14,19
166:12,14 207:9	142:19 159:23,23	junior 107:20	72:15,17 73:2,11	199:10,12,12,13
interestingly	165:11 200:17	jury 3:12 74:3 87:7	73:16,18,20,21	200:15 202:17,19
107:17	215:12,23 218:22	87:11,16,21,25	74:3,3,12 76:1,17	202:21 203:7
internal 148:1	232:9 247:24	88:5,6,10,11,14	76:19 80:2 81:20	205:16 207:15
internally 126:3	т	104:18 160:11	82:17,18 85:23	211:25 212:10,13
international 1:7	<u>J</u>	228:14 229:12,14	86:10 87:17 88:5	216:8 217:23
153:19	jacobson 1:17	229:16	88:6,13 89:8,12	218:4 220:13,15
internet 166:1	james 2:9		89:13,16 91:11	220:15 221:14
interviews 93:6	janet 2:9	<u>K</u>	92:11 95:14 96:3	223:8 228:11
intransigent 51:10	january 1:11 5:2	katz 2:5,6 5:18,18	96:5,11,19 98:2	229:7,18 230:7,11
invalidate 91:17,23	107:9 139:2	5:19	99:15 101:10,11	230:19,22,22
92:8	214:10,16,16	keep 83:9 135:4	102:12,15,24	231:2,14,17
STATE THE STATE OF	or expenses of the control of the co			CONTRACTOR

F				
232:17,25 233:15	leading 79:9,16	limited 212:5,14	96:18 97:2,17	35:8 37:8 38:4,4,5
235:22 236:6	80:13,16 82:13	line 1:7 5:6 24:12	98:1,2,20,23 99:7	47:25 53:20 56:10
237:19,19,24	learn 80:24 81:1	179:2 180:12	99:25 100:6,7,10	60:15 62:2,12,15
238:19,20 240:6	156:1 176:19	184:2 199:4	100:11,14,19	69:16 70:2,6,25
241:19 242:22,25	231:3	200:24 204:2	101:2,7,14,17	75:13 89:15,19
243:3 244:10,25	learned 13:11	222:22 231:8	102:6,19 103:3,4	90:2 91:2 112:11
245:24 246:3,10	80:22	linear 22:18 58:6	103:9 105:25	115:18 156:9
248:23,25,25	lease 168:10	58:14	108:14,22,23,24	158:1,22 172:2,7
249:9,12,15,18,22	leased 249:15	lines 236:1,5	109:1,21,22,22,23	172:14,20 206:15
250:1,12 255:15	leasings 166:24	link 166:1,5,6	110:2 111:9	207:17 212:7,7,20
knowing 21:9 31:6	led 42:10 70:13	linked 231:9	113:16,20,21,23	literally 116:9
81:20 186:14	77:7 89:21 233:15	liquidated 139:1	114:1,3,8 115:1	literature 161:3,4,4
204:19	233:16	lisa 1:21 5:23	116:15,19 117:21	161:5,10
knowledge 82:14	left 101:14 164:20	list 11:18 16:1 19:6	118:3,12,14,19,22	litigation 160:8,9
94:8,11 105:17	legacy 105:18	19:16 20:1,9,14	119:5,13,20	223:25
188:19 224:1	108:10,18,19	20:16,17,17,20,23	129:23 130:8	little 55:9 67:23,24
246:8	109:10,16	21:6,10,18,23	133:22 138:16	83:11,15 98:3,16
known 13:12	legal 5:9 24:1 47:13	22:4 28:15,16,18	139:25 142:13,20	103:16 120:2
167:21 226:1	69:7 73:20 201:7	28:21 29:2,11,13	142:24 143:14,18	132:7 146:10
	legally 201:10	29:18,22 30:1,3,4	144:18 145:20	153:6,23 154:20
L	letter 3:25 245:16	30:8,22 31:9 33:2	149:16,19 150:3	161:20 192:5
labor 15:4,5,5 16:7	245:20 246:11,15	33:8 34:22 35:2,4	150:11,25 151:5	198:9 202:17
63:22 64:19 83:23	level 75:17 144:22	35:10,16,17,18	151:17,24 152:16	216:15
183:10 190:6	levels 19:8 141:1	36:4,10,14,24	153:12 155:1,8,12	live 44:8 46:16
195:1,2 206:23	leverage 132:18,22	38:1,9,16 39:23	155:19,24 156:5,6	193:21,22 194:2
207:1,11,13,20	133:5,10,14 134:2	40:16 42:9,11,13	156:19,20 158:8	196:10 206:8
208:5	162:24 185:19	42:17,25 43:4,9	158:20,21,24	207:24
lack 74:20 212:1	199:3	44:16 45:11 47:8	159:10,11 163:10	lived 46:9
239:7	leveraged 243:3	48:2 50:11 52:5	164:14 169:6	llc 1:21
lacked 145:16	liabilities 239:25	53:14 54:16 55:17	174:4 179:21,24	llp 2:1
language 31:2	239:25 240:3	55:22 57:8,11	180:1,2,6 185:7	located 166:1
33:13 93:20	licks 149:24	59:24 60:1,5,5,13	188:3 193:3 202:7	long 9:17 70:11
107:17 112:15	lied 182:19	60:19,20,24 61:3	202:12 206:1,5,8	71:13 135:24
170:7	life 111:7	61:5 62:4 63:11	206:25 207:2,4,10	149:2 154:5 161:3
large 98:10,13	light 190:6 228:2	65:11,16,20 66:11	207:17 208:23	161:4 239:18
164:4	likelihood 13:18	66:15 67:10 73:4	209:14 210:11,20	longer 71:18
largely 219:10	14:5,22 15:7	76:7 78:6 85:5,8	211:12 217:11	165:18 221:1
larger 97:21	17:10 19:24 20:7	85:18,21 86:3,4,5	218:4 221:19	look 15:6 22:17
law 1:14 5:19 15:7	20:13,22 21:2,22	86:12,14,14,19,20	222:11 224:15	30:4,22 31:10
46:1 47:2,4,7,12	24:3,21 25:10,12	87:3,4 88:21	225:11,19 226:2,6	37:23 38:16 39:23
47:14,14 129:9	25:14 26:6 29:4	89:11,16,22 90:4	226:21,23 229:3	42:17 43:4,9
212:22	32:17,21 35:20	90:9,15,19 92:20	233:3,6,8 237:14	44:17 45:11 54:22
lawyer 33:10 47:11	36:2,12 59:15,21	93:17,23,25 94:6	241:2 246:24	56:4 58:9 60:24
lawyers 73:25	129:16 139:1	94:7,9,14,21,24	247:4,19 248:9	61:21,25 64:10
98:24	180:20,25 184:20	95:1,3,4,7,11,16	listed 62:19 72:21	65:11,16,20 67:14
laying 171:7	211:3,4 248:19	95:17,18,22,23	242:11	68:7 69:14 70:19
layoffs 139:23	limit 162:6	96:1,2,3,4,6,12,13	lists 19:20 21:12	72:19 73:13 74:2
- construction of the control of the			NOTES OF THE STATE	

76:7 78:2,18 79:8	146:13,16 154:2,4	87:15 104:13	149:12,15 153:1	meets 206:1,6
79:11,15,23,25	154:4 166:23	178:16 183:16	155:9,25 158:6	member 33:15
89:3 93:12 100:23	171:8 211:12,22	245:21	164:9 168:25	92:25 99:6,22,24
100:24 107:10	211:22 216:12	marked 3:7 6:8	173:17 177:6	members 7:19,24
110:25 112:7,19	221:20 241:22,22	12:25 53:2,6	179:25 194:9	8:5,18 72:4
113:25 121:25	244:19	87:12 104:10,19	195:14,15,16	181:10
124:17 125:21	louis 1:19 95:6	165:4,8 178:12	206:5,7,14 209:11	memorandum
127:17 135:19	103:15,21 104:1,6	183:14 188:9,11	209:15,21 213:5	179:4
139:16 143:10	105:2,6,14,20,23	236:2,6 245:17	217:5 234:12	memorandums
146:11 147:22,22	106:13,24 107:15	market 132:4,5	235:24 247:6	69:8
150:10,14,22	108:1,3,10,11	190:1 193:6 197:6	254:25 255:6	memorized 78:11
153:4 158:14,24	109:8,10 111:3,12	241:22,23	meaning 128:22	126:4
161:9 167:2 169:6	111:14,15,19,25	marketing 192:16	207:19 220:6	memory 147:20
171:9 207:13	132:11 199:18	markets 132:6	meaningful 227:8	men 64:5,10 67:20
208:10 210:3	241:13,20,22	master 114:3	means 23:9,14 62:1	mentioned 48:16
220:9 224:22	242:5,11 254:16	matched 154:10	76:20 148:17	95:5 141:21
239:6,8,21 243:19	lower 19:19 21:8	matches 154:13	244:11,25	145:17 200:25
248:6	21:14 22:1,5	material 124:15	meant 50:14 55:6	243:13
looked 11:19 19:16	53:21,24 54:6,7,8	136:25	70:4 103:15	merge 29:25 85:7
19:20 21:18 37:1	54:9,21,22,25	materials 120:8,17	107:24 115:13	85:20 101:9 102:3
58:6 60:16 73:4	55:4,19,23 56:23	121:13 127:18	140:24 253:23	merged 11:18
79:6 80:2,3 85:21	56:25 57:1,5,8,8	151:15	measure 115:16	28:14,16,18 29:2
88:22 135:21	57:10,13,15,20	matter 5:5 38:14	211:22,24 212:4	29:13,18,21 30:1
137:16 138:17	68:4,11 213:13	39:21 45:18 47:7	220:14 239:5	30:2,3,8,21 31:9
156:23 164:8	luncheon 164:25	52:2 89:8 94:5	measures 221:6,7	33:2 34:22 35:2,4
171:9 178:5 182:1	lynx 78:10,10 79:3	126:6 219:19	measuring 246:22	35:9 36:13 37:8
185:8 192:20	149:24,24 156:12	256:8,14	mec 15:24 16:22	38:15 42:9,11,12
215:25 225:1	157:4	matters 175:2,4	23:19 26:20 27:14	42:16 43:4,9
226:23 234:11		239:17	29:12 32:4,22	44:16 45:10 47:8
235:11 237:14	M	maximize 197:3	34:23,24 41:7	52:5 59:24 60:1,4
239:23 240:7	magnitude 190:3	mean 9:18 27:21	59:7 85:12 89:10	60:15,23 69:16
looking 54:18 56:6	main 166:14	32:2 44:18 45:12	89:15,22 90:3,6	70:24 85:18,20
58:19 64:17 71:2	maintain 136:22	45:17 47:11 54:10	94:10,14 96:17	86:12 88:21 89:10
114:14,25 116:9	210:20	55:5,10,12 57:22	98:18 101:23	89:14 93:17,23
156:23 182:4	maintained 110:13	59:17 61:19,20	103:11 132:22	94:6,7 115:1
205:2 230:2	110:21 210:16	71:1 72:25 73:8	133:14 174:16	133:22 138:16
242:15	major 201:6	76:17,19 77:18,22	179:13,17 180:22	144:18 156:8
looks 153:25	majority 249:16	77:23 78:13,20,24	184:21 197:10	185:7 205:25
155:11,13 166:3	making 35:5 46:22	79:21 83:22 90:1	246:6 248:17	206:7 221:19
176:18 191:9	60:11,25 67:5	96:23 97:1 98:15	251:3,7	224:15 248:8
lorenzo 153:22	98:9 121:2 172:10	103:18 106:15	mechanism 60:12	merger 3:16 30:18
losing 146:8	230:4 231:12	107:10,12 109:3	85:25 161:8 191:9	32:11 35:7 51:6
loss 146:12	management 195:1	112:17 115:11,21	192:23 193:5	69:25 70:17,17,23
losses 93:14 201:22	207:13,21 208:5	116:1,9,10,24	mediation 179:6	71:4,4 75:13 91:2
lost 26:22	manner 18:12	117:5 130:19,20	meet 72:17 128:6	117:24 123:12
lot 60:16 68:22	marginal 212:8	139:12 144:13,15	meeting 128:4,8	131:4,20 145:1
69:19 95:13	mark 6:11,13 13:1	145:4,7 146:7	180:4	156:6,8,12 157:21
	(28.578 *** (4.00)		ST 1 1272857 STREETHANDS

			-,-	
165:4,16 172:6,13	million 56:22,22	motivation 206:15	82:9 106:20	197:14 226:5
172:19 177:13	57:4 58:20,22	motivations 193:15	171:14 201:8	229:2
192:18 193:3	68:5,10 166:19	motives 193:10	needs 94:4,4 206:1	negotiations 31:21
212:24 215:17,18	168:9,10 201:22	194:16,17	206:6 207:16	50:9 51:16 66:24
215:21 216:2	mind 46:25 47:9	move 52:14	negligent 205:5	85:8 94:10,15
217:10,12 221:21	113:5 135:14,18	multifactorial	negotiate 28:25	132:18,24 133:25
221:23 224:20	199:7 210:22	212:4	36:8 43:6 160:6	134:2 160:12
236:23 248:13	minimis 221:16	multipiece 96:3	163:9 176:12	162:10 175:25
252:3	minus 139:13	multiples 255:5	194:1,1	176:13,23 194:8
mergers 38:1,7	164:15 210:6	multiplier 56:14	negotiated 28:3	195:21,23 197:10
47:20 70:4,22	minutes 84:16		32:13 33:22 35:4	226:20,24 227:2
98:6 142:20,24	164:20 254:5	N	35:18 36:3,7 41:7	230:20 251:2,6
143:15 153:14	mischaracterizes	name 5:8 125:22	41:24 42:2 59:17	negotiators 157:15
157:1 158:1 172:2	45:15 46:3	128:10,13 187:21	59:18,21 61:5	160:2,14 193:13
212:7,19,22	mischaracterizing	named 92:23	62:2,7,12,23	193:17,20,25
214:12 215:23	110:16	names 20:17 95:7	64:25 90:4 122:12	194:16 196:14
217:11,25 218:1	misordering	108:23,25 207:3,3	159:20 161:8,12	neither 181:15
220:9 255:15	155:19	207:4,5,8	161:20 162:2	net 238:13
merging 70:1	missing 145:20	narrow 83:8	164:5,10,13,15	never 53:11 75:4
115:18	146:2	185:10	180:21 184:22	77:12,25 79:5,5
merits 144:3	missouri 1:19	narrowbody 103:1	191:16,18 192:14	82:16 115:17,20
met 93:18,24 115:2	misstatement	111:5 114:4,5	192:15 202:6,11	150:13,13,19,20
172:5,18 189:23	121:23	narrower 213:15	negotiating 36:6	150:21 174:7
195:8 234:19	mistaken 122:23	nassau 1:13	38:22 51:14 96:16	179:20,22 181:11
235:23,23	model 3:11 22:8,18	national 241:15	96:21 97:18 98:18	183:2,3,3,22
method 23:11 26:5	53:2,8 58:7 59:5	nature 131:23	122:25 123:1	231:1,8 232:9
63:22 89:2 115:9	59:15 96:24	167:8 202:17	172:13 175:4	233:12
115:13,14 142:16	111:18,23 154:25	212:12	186:10 192:8,9	new 1:1,14,15,16
methodologies 15:1	175:14 207:15	near 153:11 168:20	195:2 252:19	1:22 2:3,3 5:3,7
15:16	modeling 155:3	218:11 250:22	negotiation 31:5,24	207:2 256:2,6
methodology 8:3	models 15:9,10	251:11	32:3,14,21 33:18	newspaper 147:1
8:15 11:25 12:17	25:5 57:21 205:4	necessarily 39:3	34:24 35:14,21,24	nice 128:1
13:16 14:3,15,21	modify 102:19	90:5 176:10,10	36:18,20 38:21,23	nine 58:10 71:15
16:6 24:5,20 25:1	103:9	185:6 189:24	39:1,1,11 41:16	126:10 142:17
59:9,13 115:6,8	modifying 105:24	necessary 41:23	43:19 48:10 51:18	172:1 205:21
metric 70:21	money 146:8 171:8	89:18	66:5 88:22 95:23	normal 71:14
131:18 176:25	171:13	need 12:12 32:10	98:19 100:8,12	notary 1:15 256:6
196:3 218:19	months 126:10,11	33:14 50:10,10	121:1 123:9	256:23
metrics 218:19	126:11	59:23 61:19 69:2	159:14,25 160:6	note 247:20
michael 4:1 245:17	morgan 105:6	70:16,21,22 74:6	162:8,14 163:6,8	noted 27:4
245:23	morning 6:6,7	74:11 83:7 84:17	163:18 169:1,2,11	notes 256:13
micronumerosity	71:24 80:23	86:1 101:20 103:8	169:12 174:15,23	notice 219:2
220:6 255:13	motion 91:16,23	106:18,23 132:8	175:18,22 176:3	notion 173:12
middle 33:17 93:13	92:4,13	189:23 205:10	181:13 183:3	notwithstanding
109:2 160:23	motions 69:8	212:3 218:4 220:8	191:2,22,25 194:3	173:9
midwest 79:2	motivated 205:25	220:8	194:14,21,25	nuanced 103:3
156:12 157:3	207:14	needed 16:14 66:4	195:6,17 196:4,8	104:7 113:19
L			Constant State Sta	

	l	1	l	
number 5:8 37:1	81:25 140:13	37:22 38:2,13	operations 121:21	74:14 161:8,9
53:14 54:15 58:7	182:16 189:17	41:13 44:12 47:24	122:24 136:7	outlined 131:2
69:21 70:22 84:22	247:20	53:5,12,16,20,24	250:22 251:11	output 114:11
96:25 97:3 99:2,4	objections 10:17	54:9 56:21 58:2	opine 138:14	outside 10:15
107:6 127:19	44:23 180:12	59:3 61:25 63:21	opining 60:18	103:20 104:5
140:21 144:15,19	objective 99:19	69:21 72:5,21	121:8	146:23,25 147:12
144:24 156:19,20	100:2	74:12 79:5 80:24	opinion 7:18,23 8:2	235:5,8
156:23 164:24	objectives 92:4	84:9,19 95:10,21	8:7,9,12 29:3	overall 24:6,6,23
186:6 201:10	193:18	96:10 101:3,6	32:16,20 36:12	24:24 25:14 26:5
203:13 207:4	observation 158:15	104:20,20,21,22	38:12 58:2 59:8	71:20 98:5 158:19
210:8 212:5	observations 212:6	104:24 106:2,22	63:15 90:16	238:12 239:8
225:18 239:7	220:7,13	109:14 113:24	113:21 119:3	oversight 72:14
243:9,25 244:3,4	observe 55:8 212:6	114:14,24 118:11	136:11,15,19	151:19
244:14,19 245:8	observed 133:10	118:20 119:18	137:6,14,22	owed 99:15 166:23
245:11,12,13	obtain 148:7	143:16 145:12,22	138:10,22,23	166:23 171:8
248:18 249:22	236:23	151:11 160:15	187:17 223:11	owned 249:10,19
254:20 255:5,19	obtained 147:17	161:17 162:17	opinions 6:21 7:10	ownership 249:13
numbers 53:11	obviously 147:23	163:4,21 164:1	63:5,9	
57:20 68:8 96:11	169:1 201:12,13	165:25 166:8,10	opportunities	<u>P</u>
102:1 107:14	occur 139:23 185:3	167:25 168:2	107:23 195:19	page 3:2,7 6:18
154:9 212:14	205:1	173:15 178:14	opposed 67:8	22:15 37:23 53:9
244:20	occurring 29:5	179:1,3,10,12,14	186:15	56:8 58:6,9,18,19
numerous 213:7	october 7:14	180:15 181:17	opposite 33:15	68:9 78:3 93:10
	odd 156:7	183:6,9,21 188:16	192:3	104:25 105:1
O	offer 6:21 7:10	188:25 189:4,5,12	option 36:16	110:25 111:2
object 8:6,10 9:10	11:10 63:14	189:17 198:8	options 43:3,10	112:7 134:5
10:5,14,19,24,24	136:19 137:6,22	199:25 200:22	163:7 167:4	139:16,16 142:17
12:3 13:21 16:2	166:15,19 167:9	205:23 210:19	169:10 170:17	143:13 150:4
17:3 24:8 25:2	167:11,14,18,21	222:9 229:14	oral 1:13	151:21 165:23,24
26:9 27:2,16	170:6,6,13 229:18	232:21 238:7,11	order 11:11 51:16	166:6 168:1,5
28:11,13 29:14	offered 178:1 205:9	246:3,14 253:16	54:6 75:15 86:2	170:1 172:1
34:11 37:16 39:25	205:18 226:1,20	253:24	95:8 96:12 97:1	178:18,20 179:2
40:1 41:13 42:23	offering 63:4,9	old 233:7,10	98:7 106:24 109:1	180:12 183:25
43:12 44:19 45:1	119:3 136:11,15	once 36:5 41:15	110:13,21 113:18	184:2 189:1,2,5
45:14 46:2 50:18	138:21,23 221:25	51:5 52:22 97:22	114:2 139:23	200:24 205:20
52:7,14,19 65:24	offers 120:3,3	103:5	144:11 155:14,24	210:4,7,24,24
77:10 81:16,17	office 1:14	ones 65:4,5 127:20	169:5 195:17	236:9 238:7,12
83:3,19 99:10	officer 80:20 81:5	127:20 131:10,11	241:12,18	246:15,16
109:18 110:8,15	111:3 139:21	149:23 150:22	ordering 101:15	pages 229:17
137:25 140:5	officers 103:2	164:12	original 252:10	paid 64:11 126:19
186:1 192:2	107:20 114:5,5	operate 72:8	ought 62:24 70:1	127:1,3,7
197:15 198:25	oh 61:23 100:17	217:10	74:2 233:21	pan 146:20 164:15
215:10 228:9	104:20 128:10	operating 125:14	outcome 67:3 71:5	235:3
237:5,16 239:15	150:22 155:3	217:7,8 239:10	108:15 133:25	panel 206:24
253:4	248:6 252:6	operation 111:8	175:7 215:21,22	paper 102:4 104:17
objection 27:4 49:5	okay 6:17 14:3	121:4 217:13	220:18 228:13	125:5,8,21 206:20
52:11,19 77:3	20:22 27:21 32:10	246:22	outcomes 64:15	206:21,22 235:5
86.26.26.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.				

	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		1
papers 79:21	161:16,17 175:8	period 72:12 110:6	91:5,9,18,23 92:5	226:5,15,17,20,21
159:24	175:17 176:12,14	135:13 184:12	93:3 96:11 97:9	227:5,11 228:1,6
paragraph 56:12	192:13 206:25	232:1	98:7,21 100:5,6	228:22 229:19
93:12,13 111:1	256:11,16	permits 63:14	100:10,19 101:2	230:10,10,12,13
112:22 114:15,17	partly 156:6	person 38:21 67:19	101:12 102:25	230:24 231:1,4,11
114:19,21 134:5	parts 212:12	67:23 98:3,3	103:1,2,16,20,21	231:13,20 233:4
139:17 142:17	party 29:1 117:25	128:6	105:6 107:25	233:11 236:18
143:21 151:21	121:1 185:20	personally 68:20	108:3,10,19,20	237:2 243:25
168:8 170:2	200:14	71:6,20 236:7	109:2,7,10,16	244:4,13 245:8,12
171:25 179:3	passengers 135:22	persuade 90:9,14	110:5,13,21 111:4	253:3,12 254:2,8
205:20 209:24	path 183:1 227:25	90:18 136:5	111:6 112:10,18	254:20 255:5
210:3,7,23 236:18	233:16	180:10 185:20	112:24 113:6	pin 213:17
238:12 240:10,11	patrick 1:4	persuaded 173:5	118:5,25 119:12	place 36:19,20 64:9
park 1:14	patterns 215:1	185:16	119:20 123:8	110:14 175:17
part 40:8 41:12	paul 2:1 5:15	perturb 55:10	129:21,25 130:4,8	187:22 233:3
43:19 75:12 93:7	pay 64:5,7,10	pessimistic 124:5	133:21 136:16,21	placement 111:8
93:14 114:7 119:2	129:24 130:3,6,21	ph 72:11	136:22 137:4,7,23	116:15,19 188:2
140:23 151:12,19	130:24 141:5,6,14	phrase 23:7,14	138:11,19 139:19	plaintiff 1:20,23
166:20 174:25	141:25	197:16	139:24,25 140:4	5:4
193:3 222:8 237:4	payments 166:25	pick 154:14	141:6,7 142:1	plaintiffs 1:5 5:22
249:23	168:10 171:4	picture 83:25	149:18 152:24	5:24 13:9 92:23
participate 66:24	pc 2:5	piece 9:22 224:21	158:7,25 161:24	93:15 128:24
participation 85:11	pdf 166:6,7	pieces 104:17 145:2	162:22,24 172:6	plan 7:8 51:20
particular 21:9	peerreviewed	145:3 154:15	172:13 173:18,21	205:19 212:1
51:22 63:23 67:6	117:3	178:4 198:2	173:24 174:6,11	244:13
67:9 87:21 88:1	pending 20:5 27:9	pilot 3:13 11:23	181:15 185:24	planes 76:23 107:6
103:14 112:25	45:8 247:14	74:11 99:15 104:5	186:6,15,23 187:8	107:14,16 109:4
118:13,21 125:5	people 50:7,24	104:9,14 105:8,18	188:2 189:8	134:8 150:1 153:9
132:4,7 140:15	68:21 70:15 71:2	139:22 140:12,15	190:23 191:11	171:8 215:14
146:23 147:6	109:24 154:2	141:1 142:11	195:7,9,11,16,25	216:15 221:15
163:1 164:7	157:18 225:12	177:10 195:7	197:13,22,23,25	244:14 248:4,4
175:25 182:21	230:11	196:1,6,7 216:17	198:3,13,15,16,23	249:4,9,12,16,18
192:12 197:14	perceive 207:23	224:11 234:7	199:14,16,17	249:20,22 250:7,9
212:23 215:5,6	perceived 160:21	240:22 241:1	200:4,11,13 201:6 201:8,15,20 202:6	250:11,14
225:9 231:16	percent 22:4 23:20	243:20,23 244:3	, ,	planning 189:7 plans 6:23,25 7:9
241:12 248:24	24:4 25:11,13	244:15 247:2,16 255:1	202:11,20,20 203:2 206:2,8	205:17
particularly 122:15	55:13 56:16 58:7	pilots 1:7 5:6 11:15	,	play 39:10 109:25
127:20 146:14	58:12,13,14,15,21	15:25 16:23 18:13	208:14,18,22 209:13 210:11,17	117:20 199:13
151:23 157:24	58:24 174:1 221:4 221:5,6	18:14 19:2,7	211:2 213:23,24	played 31:4
190:6 241:21 particulars 191:8	l '	23:17 26:21 27:14	211.2 213.23,24 214:5,15,16,21	player 200:16
1 1	perception 58:13 227:12 228:7	29:12 30:6,17	214.5,75,10,21	241:23
parties 13:19 14:6 14:17 15:18 39:11	perform 16:10 28:2	34:2,8,14,20 39:9	216:16,19 219:12	please 5:13 6:1
	perform 10.10 28.2 performed 35:22	40:9 41:22 44:6	219:16,17 221:16	13:24 20:3 30:9
43:5,6 94:16,23 97:19 99:8 100:7	38:24 40:22	46:9,19 56:18	223:3,13,16,20	45:6 49:8 57:12
100:11 116:18	138:15	65:9,14 70:5	224:1,6,7 225:14	57:13 87:18 130:1
117:16 160:9	perfunctory 144:21	73:18,25 90:20	225:18 226:1,2,4	167:19 202:8
117.10 100.9	periunciony 144.21	13.10,23 30.20	223.10 220.1,2,T	107.17 202.0
	l			l

		I		1
ploy 187:14	85:4,6,14 192:25	premerger 129:20	137:25 140:5,13	principal 72:7
plus 128:2 145:3	194:23 248:15	130:7 213:22,23	178:22,24 182:16	prior 18:20,23
point 48:23 50:9	possible 64:4 98:10	214:4	183:12 186:1	30:17 45:16 46:4
67:9 69:18 90:17	98:12,14 112:12	premise 42:18,21	192:2 197:15	83:1 84:14 121:19
101:8 160:5	172:5,23,24	50:1	198:24 199:3	173:15 183:18
161:23 168:23	possibly 204:20	preparation 68:17	204:10,13 215:10	190:10 200:25
169:22 170:24	post 38:1	127:16,17 128:22	218:13 228:9	224:5,11 231:4,21
172:16,25 173:10	postderegulation	190:11	237:5,16 239:15	233:6 238:17,20
181:7 194:20,23	143:15 246:17	prepare 127:11	240:11 247:10,20	248:17
195:5 197:9,12,17	posttransaction	prepared 168:14	253:4,13	probabilities 22:18
197:18 228:16	223:20 224:3	180:16 184:17	pressing 219:19	22:21,22 23:4,7,8
230:20 232:6,22	potential 186:18	186:22	pressure 86:9	23:11,14 25:8,19
244:21 246:15	203:14 245:9	preparing 183:19	198:4,11,12,21	25:20 26:2,7,12
247:5,6,7,9	potentially 75:24	presence 192:8	199:21 200:2,12	26:14 58:7,11
points 212:16	76:5,6 243:14	present 1:16 2:9	200:13,19 202:5	213:12
220:10	245:4 250:13	91:6 100:1 128:8	202:11 203:1	probability 14:17
policy 69:25 177:13	power 41:16 43:25	presentation 131:2	presumably 31:23	14:23 15:17,22
poorly 207:25	44:21 45:24,24	242:7,8,13,14,16	86:25 89:4 118:16	16:22 21:2,5 22:2
population 141:2	46:24 47:1,2,7,10	presented 53:15	137:2 175:7	23:19 24:6,7,24
244:12	47:16,16 48:11,15	91:3	195:13 250:10	24:24 25:5,22,24
porous 103:17,18	52:24 133:23	presenting 225:11	presume 73:17	33:20,21 56:16
portion 107:19	powered 41:11	preserve 52:17,18	presumption	58:21 59:5,25
175:13	powerful 40:23	157:22 210:10	229:22	probably 72:12
portions 154:15	pre 142:5	211:1	pretransaction	84:4 96:1 122:4
position 51:5,5,23	prebankruptcy	preserved 118:4,23	118:4,24 129:24	127:2,2 151:4
96:17 105:10,19	105:7	223:12 234:5	130:3 142:4,6,10	162:5 204:17
119:24 120:11	preceded 229:20	preserving 142:10	146:3 210:10,11	233:19
121:3,20 122:25	precise 21:1 213:15	210:25	210:16,25 223:12	problem 16:19
123:1 132:11	235:18	president 178:14	223:16 234:6	43:18 83:4 106:7
135:4 137:22	precisely 37:11	182:1	253:2,2,11 254:1	106:20 154:9
139:24 184:3,14	99:21 103:24	press 1:18 5:21,21	pretrial 160:11	220:5 227:1
185:5,5 186:10,19	213:18 255:16	8:6 9:10 10:5,14	pretty 100:4	255:13
221:18 247:1,15	predicated 39:6,6	10:21 12:3 13:21	140:19 148:11	proceed 6:4 10:3
252:19	predicating 170:25	16:2 17:3 23:21	161:24	40:6 44:13 50:9
positions 105:5	predict 14:22 58:15	24:8 25:2 26:9,22	prevailed 201:10	proceeding 74:25
111:3 116:18	185:4 195:22	27:2,16 28:11	201:14	80:1,6,8
120:14	220:18	29:14 34:11,14	previous 201:1	process 33:3 35:22
positive 153:1	predictive 159:19	37:16 39:25 41:9	248:24	35:24 42:10 43:19
positively 207:19	174:22 175:24	42:22 43:12 44:19	previously 33:5	44:10,11 67:6
possess 193:15	176:6,8	44:25 45:14 46:2	104:19 165:14	70:23 85:17
possibilities 35:20	preface 120:21	49:5 50:18 52:7	174:18 177:24	117:20 157:9,12
36:13 60:4	prefaced 40:3	52:12,16 65:24	188:14 191:21	191:2,24 212:4
possibility 26:18	preferences 140:7	77:3,10 80:11	253:9	229:24 230:5,25
27:11,24 41:6,24	140:16 161:24	81:16,25 83:3,19	primarily 242:22	231:10,13
42:15 48:17 55:15	preferred 54:7,13	99:10 109:18	primary 184:11	processes 159:15
55:20,22 60:22	54:14 186:6	110:8,15 114:19	princeton 1:14,15	produce 176:24
61:4 81:22 82:2	prehearing 201:22	119:6 124:12	5:2 72:6	produced 21:6
				_

05.24	nronogod 20:20	82:23,25 83:6	26:23 27:1,7,9,10	quite 20:20,21 37:1
95:24	proposed 20:20	151:11 158:18	27:17 28:12 29:15	69:18 73:5,11
professional	81:8 89:15,19	į.	30:9 34:12 36:11	86:16 95:4 118:18
113:21 233:22	90:6 94:14 95:1	pursue 193:19)
professionals	95:22 105:25	pursued 24:22	37:17 40:1,12 41:13 43:17 44:20	121:3,20 137:14 150:12 153:20
160:18	119:5 179:4	25:15 126:3		
professor 6:6 85:2	185:25 226:2,4	push 162:7	45:1,6,8,9,15 46:3	156:16 169:7 181:12 201:11
125:8 138:7	proposing 89:23	put 52:22 86:8 95:8 95:8 98:22 100:6	47:17 49:8 50:12	216:4 218:1
165:15 181:25	100:8,12 179:5		50:19,20 52:8,8	
profit 146:12	prospect 170:4	102:21 124:6	52:14,20 60:21 62:20 65:25 77:5	220:13,14 quoting 161:18
238:22	184:4 240:22 241:1	135:14,17 150:3 153:11 157:17	81:17,18 82:18,20	quoting 101.16
profitability		162:15 164:3		R
239:12	prospectively		83:4,5,8,15,16,20 88:13 90:1 91:15	ralph 166:18
profits 221:3	107:8	199:21 200:12,13	92:2 99:11 106:16	ramifications
238:13,17	prospects 124:6 146:9 240:15	200:18 202:5,10 203:1	107:7,7 108:8	33:11
progressions 216:1			107:7,7 108:8	random 54:20
projection 107:9	protect 98:8 103:15	puts 100:10	116:22 117:9	rank 78:13,25
projections 135:22	protection 91:10 169:19 236:20	putting 72:16 129:23	118:20 130:25	101:16,19 113:7
promise 90:25 promotion 211:3	provide 151:25	129.23	133:24 137:5	113:17 139:12
. ~	205:25	Q	140:6 147:20	144:13,16 145:4
promotional 209:15	provided 34:9 74:9	qualifications 9:7	153:3 154:5,23,24	155:24,25 157:22
	125:13 128:20	qualified 94:6	159:24 163:23	158:6 207:6,8
proper 8:3,14 10:22 23:11 24:5	151:16 213:2	quality 111:7	164:2 168:3,4	208:6 209:11
26:5 99:12 101:18	provides 101:17	quantification 59:4	173:10 174:17	210:6 235:24
123:10	provides 101.17 providing 207:22	59:14	175.10 174.17	255:7
	provision 34:3,8	quantify 8:3,18 9:3	170.4,17 179.2,13	ranked 207:17,20
proportional 62:1 70:25 77:18,22,22	39:16 41:21 48:18	10:4 11:8 13:17	184:8 185:10	207:21
77:23 78:13,19,24	91:5,24 92:6,17	14:5,16 15:17,22	186:2,12 189:6,19	ranking 18:13,15
97:1 115:10,20,25	120:2 187:8	16:21 19:5,14	191:7 192:3	207:10
116:9,24 117:4	189:14	20:22 21:5,22	197:16 201:3	rankings 19:2
139:12 149:11,15	provisions 23:18	22:2 55:21 111:23	202:8 204:17	207:12,12,12,14
153:1 155:9 158:5	186:24 189:22	116:21 132:16	209:25 215:13	207:18
164:9 209:21	public 1:15 79:8	213:12 242:1	218:7,22 223:2	ranks 77:18 78:20
210:6 254:25	147:3 206:23	quantifying 8:15	228:4,10 233:25	97:1 113:3 115:11
255:6	256:6,23	12:9,18	237:6,10,17	115:21 116:1,10
proposal 91:7	publicly 145:24	quantitatively	239:16 245:3,5,14	116:25 117:5
116:12,14 167:5	146:5 147:17	213:15	247:11,11,14,15	149:12,15 155:9
171:18 227:11,11	148:9,20	quantity 7:18,20,24	247:21 249:11	164:9 209:15,21
227:19 228:6	published 17:8	quarrel 229:23	252:5,11 253:5,7	210:10,17,25
proposals 90:2	159:23	question 8:7,10 9:2	253:16,21	ranzman 2:5 5:19
95:12 135:2	pull 114:2	9:11 10:6,20,23	questioning 24:12	rate 221:3
171:23 226:18	punching 195:3	12:7,12,16 13:21	231:8	rated 207:25
227:2,4,5 231:4	purchase 24:2	13:24 14:1,9,14	questions 10:15	rates 141:5,6,14,25
propose 20:1,9,14	45:25 134:6,7	15:10 16:3,13,16	12:4 72:19 107:12	ratings 79:15
20:16,18,23 22:5	purchaser 137:2	16:17 17:4 20:3,5	123:18 204:3,18	ratio 97:4,5,6,7,24
94:9 118:4,23	purpose 82:8,17,22	20:6 21:4 23:22	211:10,17 218:13	225:21,21,22,24
226:6	purposes 82:8,10	24:9 26:3,10,15	222:22	rationale 120:14
	r=1p0500 02.0,10	, ,		
Company Makes and the Company of the			I	I
and the second s				

				1490 200
raw 112:19	reads 189:6	126:3 129:11	103:9	133:4 134:18
reach 14:7,17	ready 218:6	131:10,11 143:9	reflects 175:7	172:3 203:5,10,15
15:25 33:19,22	real 130:15,19	178:5 183:20,23	237:23,23	203:20,24 204:4,6
35:4 36:6 43:7	223:7 235:20	188:4 193:10	reframe 20:25	204:7,8 205:10,14
50:10 51:10	241:17,24 249:7	206:22 208:11	refused 92:5 187:8	223:4 224:14
117:10,14,16	realistic 170:4	246:1	regard 16:23 36:23	231:24 238:24
123:11 179:17	216:16	recalling 183:22	39:17 70:18	239:13,19 240:19
184:21 192:14	realities 193:6	receipt 236:19	115:17 142:14,15	243:6,8,11 244:7
194:4,8,11,20	reality 99:8 182:21	received 237:3	171:19 185:24	244:16 245:4,5
195:15	realize 177:12,12	recess 84:23 164:25	197:1 223:17	248:19 250:13
reached 13:20 14:7	realized 69:13	181:21	224:2	relied 123:18 131:1
14:24 15:18 16:24	70:10	recognize 86:2	regarding 3:16,22	rely 115:25 146:13
22:23 23:5 24:4,7	really 31:25 59:8	98:17	29:13 49:3,11	relying 137:9
24:22,25 25:10,13	59:10,12 64:14	recollection 74:21	92:6 119:24 165:4	227:15 242:13,14
25:14,23,24 26:6	68:19 83:7 104:2	100:21 120:11,13	172:2 176:24	250:6
26:21 27:15 28:1	111:13 133:24	126:8 147:24	182:2 189:14	remaining 207:6
28:9 32:6,25 41:8	140:5 156:3,8,22	188:19	223:21 229:19	remember 96:19
41:25 42:3,5 59:6	158:3 162:6,23	reconstructions	235:25 247:1,16	103:24 122:5
59:16 61:6 85:18	169:23 175:20	185:1	regional 149:25	126:7,13 141:22
101:22 103:10	181:11 198:4	record 5:12,14	153:6,7,8 216:15	150:1 165:17
179:6 197:21	219:14 225:12	84:20,25 99:12	regular 238:13,17	167:1,2 169:3
248:16,20	233:17 240:23	110:17 125:2	regularly 72:18	182:4 187:4 207:3
reaching 194:3	242:10 250:18	164:22 165:2	rehired 160:19,20	208:25 217:20
196:21 197:1,2	reason 8:17,21	169:4 181:18,20	161:1 196:22	220:4 222:7
read 20:4 24:11	36:21 38:8 47:19	181:23 211:16	207:16	remembering
26:23 27:6,8 45:7	48:3 94:12 131:12	230:8,19 239:12	reinforced 167:3	235:18
59:9 69:5,6,20	131:12 145:19	252:12 255:17	related 73:10 111:2	renegotiation
80:5,8,11,15 81:7	159:17,22 165:19	redo 155:21	127:20 143:23	171:4
100:20 102:23	184:25 185:12	reduce 213:8	214:22 247:5,8	reno 150:5,9
100:20 102:23	210:19 211:20	244:14	relation 192:22	187:24 188:2
110:22,23 111:16	219:6 249:7	refer 19:19 30:12	relations 183:10	201:3,4,20 202:1
114:18 120:1,2,2	reasonable 54:24	57:13 209:23	207:1	202:20 208:13,22
124:14,15 125:2,5	54:25 118:18	reference 125:7	relationship 140:25	209:8 246:18
124.14,13 123.2,3	126:22 154:10	150:5 189:12	159:25 192:7	248:25
135:6 136:24,25	160:21 164:2	referenced 165:13	201:15 255:16	reorganization
137:13,15 138:7	216:19 219:21	167:25 191:13	relative 15:14	170:4
154:6 165:17	reasonably 153:1	referred 72:4	101:15,18 110:13	repeat 13:23 20:3
166:22,22 169:10	176:11,14	144:13	110:21 133:15,23	30:9 45:5 49:7
170:11 178:6	reasoning 146:15	referring 125:17	139:24 175:11	108:7 130:1 168:2
190:10 200:23	146:18	134:6 147:1 170:6	209:18 210:10,16	174:17 202:8
220:24 230:6,7,17	reasons 83:20	174:2 210:1	210:25 232:3,13	report 3:8,9 6:8,12
247:6,11,13	152:2 172:4	229:12	243:25 244:4	6:15,16,18,20
reading 70:16 71:2	186:14	reflect 95:9 227:4	245:8 254:20	7:11,14,17 8:17
125:2 137:15	recall 72:24 74:18	reflected 7:10 99:7	256:17	9:21 10:3,3 12:20
156:25 169:3	74:19 87:10,10	110:1 214:24	relevant 7:1,4,6	12:24 13:2,6,13
	114:16 120:17	reflection 226:23	31:16 62:24 75:2	13:14 16:15 17:15
202:16 220:23 256:9		reflective 101:21	75:8,19 108:24	19:14 22:11,16
230.9	121:12,22 125:23	renective 101.21	13.0,17 100.24	17.14 44.11,10
CONTRACTOR DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE	TELEGRESS LOUIS CONTRACTOR AND		. 11. Personalis Demonstras 123 125 il 2 <mark>020 il 2020 i</mark>	enerales (1979-1911), el porque procesa de la la calca de la c

				<u> </u>
24:10 34:21 35:1	228:1,8,12,16,21	66:12 91:24 100:5	107:11	241:11 244:6
37:21,24 58:5	229:11,21 230:1	108:4,12 131:25	return 90:24 221:3	251:3
62:4 68:12,17,20	231:5,9	147:14 148:14	revealed 164:4	rights 182:23
72:22 73:14 76:11	representative	167:16 215:4	revenues 135:21	rikk 3:9 12:21,22
78:3 93:10,12	11:14 15:23 17:1	248:15 249:18	review 68:20 74:24	12:24 13:2 229:1
95:5 96:24 102:5	representatives	250:10,19	141:9 142:8 203:4	risk 76:12,23
112:7 114:15	49:16 203:19	respective 256:11	205:11,17 210:15	161:15,18 190:3,6
127:15 134:5	represented 39:12	respond 189:25	210:22 218:25	risks 161:25
139:17 142:17,25	70:6 87:1 89:5	247:7	reviewed 12:20	river 230:12
143:11,13 148:1	121:9 150:20	response 88:13	68:16,22,23 87:7	road 163:20 198:7
150:4 151:22,25	173:22 176:2,2,11	responsibility	120:8,18 121:13	rodriguez 1:21,21
165:21 168:14	176:14 177:10,13	180:7	142:19 183:18	5:23,23 10:18
170:10 171:25	177:19 181:9	responsive 154:22	236:7	12:23 178:23
180:17 183:19	197:13 227:7,9,20	rest 62:8 97:4,5,7,7	reviewing 71:7	role 117:20 139:20
184:17 190:11	227:22 228:3	156:17 159:1	234:14	romm 2:2 5:17
205:20,22 209:23	231:1,11,14	207:8	reward 236:21	rough 102:23
210:1,7,23 240:10	representing 5:20	restated 26:23	237:3	roughly 78:25
reported 68:23	30:16 65:9 117:25	restrictions 112:1	rhetoric 120:24,24	196:9 221:13,13
69:2 142:21	123:8 179:13	159:5,10 254:15	121:1,2	route 158:4 241:5
201:19 256:7	226:14 230:23	restructure 166:25	rich 151:23	242:19
reporter 1:15 5:10	represents 236:21	result 28:10 36:3,3	richards 1:21	routes 139:21
6:1 20:4 27:8	republic 79:2,3	41:24 42:2,5	rifkin 5:16	140:17 171:3
45:7 247:13 256:6	152:22 153:5	60:13 64:25 67:7	rifkind 2:1	241:5 244:14
reports 71:2 79:12	156:6,11 157:2,3	75:15 94:15 95:7	right 15:19 31:3,8	248:1
80:3 146:14 151:6	158:2	112:12 116:14,18	39:3,4 40:5,15,25	rule 183:3 205:14
216:5 220:23	reputation 193:23	122:12 125:14	42:14 45:3,19	ruling 192:23,24,25
221:10	201:13	153:10 156:17	46:10,19,20 48:12	rulings 80:5
represent 23:2 40:7	require 51:22 61:3	161:5 169:17	48:13 54:6 66:2,4	running 158:5
40:8 44:6 196:8	107:22	172:14 192:20	66:6,10,18 69:18	runs 72:9 160:1
227:3	required 34:2	196:21 197:2,2	74:10 78:3 88:10	
representation	99:21 177:9	201:19 215:18	90:22,23 99:18	S
17:12 19:25 20:9	reread 127:15	230:10 247:3,17	100:22 106:1,12	salamat 3:9 12:21
21:24 26:19 27:13	research 17:8	248:5	108:21,22 119:11	12:22,23,24 13:3
28:2,8 29:9 31:23	117:4 234:9	resulted 28:15	119:19 138:8	22:7,21 23:15
32:23 35:23 38:25	resembling 94:9	93:17,23 94:1,22	146:18 151:4,9,16	37:25 47:25 57:11
40:22 44:10 51:3	reserved 98:21	115:1 226:24	153:22,25 162:9	58:20 111:17
55:18 61:12 63:2	101:1	results 17:14 64:25	163:6 172:24	150:4 229:1
63:7,13,17,24	reserves 105:4	118:14 152:1	174:7,7,20 175:22	salamats 3:10
67:3 69:13 74:5,6	111:2	159:18,19 161:12	176:23 182:22	22:11,16 23:3
85:20 87:22 88:2	resolution 148:25	161:13 162:10,11	187:22 191:3,18	37:21 53:1,7
88:16 93:19,25	161:7 191:17	163:11,12 174:15	191:23,25 193:14	56:21 57:7,19
94:17 115:3	192:22 193:5	174:21,22 175:23	194:15 196:14	58:1,5 59:9
118:16 129:8	resolutions 163:13	175:25 176:5,24	197:2 198:15	143:10
133:9 138:16	resolved 201:9	177:1 191:14,24	200:15 206:19	salient 154:15
172:6,18 174:13	resources 16:10	retained 13:9 71:22	208:11 209:24	sample 54:18 64:24
176:16 215:20	46:14	73:25 126:5	213:7 214:13	65:1,21 124:1
226:15 227:13,15	respect 34:3 65:22	retrospectively	233:9 239:22	214:2
		-		

	1	I	l	
sampling 213:10	235:12,19 236:1,5	165:10,11 187:3	132:19,24 138:16	168:21,24 169:24
sat 174:2	238:9	188:13 204:4	139:18,24 141:1	set 22:1 60:10
satisfied 83:9	searching 74:14	208:15 245:24	141:12 142:19	67:18 70:6,13
saw 34:5 53:11	84:6 147:23	246:18	143:3,24 144:18	77:14 89:3 124:7
90:2,3 136:25	second 111:1	seldom 141:21	148:25 149:19	154:10 157:1
141:16 144:16	156:14 168:8	select 99:19 139:7	150:8 151:24	195:24 196:3
147:25 149:21	205:24	selected 150:21	154:25 156:9,12	237:21 239:3
166:21 222:2	section 98:20	207:25	157:9,22 159:18	253:19
242:7 249:2	sector 206:23	selfserving 121:5,7	159:20 163:15	setting 163:11
saying 33:1 44:8	secure 189:8	sell 230:12 249:4,4	169:6 172:2,7,14	195:1
47:15 49:24 54:12	see 13:13 22:18,20	selling 249:6,6	172:19 173:13	settled 15:15
57:12 60:7,14	37:25 38:3 47:24	sends 207:2	174:12,21 175:24	settlement 28:3
61:9,10,18 64:2	48:2 53:10,17,24	seniority 3:13	176:24 177:9	32:13 33:22
69:22 85:15,19	56:9,19 58:5,16	11:16,18,18,24,25	179:7,18,21,24	160:12 191:8
86:18 87:3 95:21	58:19 62:3 69:7	16:1,24 17:11	180:1,2,6,11	192:14
108:17 120:22	93:19 104:25	18:13,15,23 19:2	182:3,11,12 184:4	settlements 68:4
121:22 136:1	105:11 106:7	19:6,8,15,20	184:22 185:7,17	161:20,21 164:5
146:11 147:21	111:1 112:9,15,20	28:15,16,18 29:11	185:21 188:3	192:15
176:8,18 185:7	112:21 115:15	29:13,18,22 30:1	189:14 191:1	settling 15:8
190:18 192:21	116:11 122:14	30:3,3,8,21 31:9	193:3 194:10,13	seven 54:23 55:2
193:19,25 199:19	134:10 140:1	31:14 32:18 33:2	199:18 202:7,12	61:13 62:6 65:1
200:17,19 204:19	141:9 142:8,22	33:8 34:3,10,22	206:1,8,14 208:13	65:20 66:14
204:21,22 226:22	143:14 150:4,10	35:2,8,10 36:4,10	208:23 210:11	191:13 207:3
227:10,16 228:5	150:15 151:10	36:14,23 37:8	211:8 212:20	234:5,10
230:16	152:3,25 155:14	38.9,15 39:17,22	217:1 219:1	seventh 55:5
says 24:21 46:15	161:19 164:6,8	40:15 41:21 42:9	220:19 221:19	sex 64:4
47:14 56:9,13	166:1,17 168:5	42:11,13,16 43:4	224:15 229:19	shade 70:13
58:10 68:1 93:13	169:9 170:1,3,7	44:16 45:11 47:8	233:2,6,8 237:13	shading 141:19
105:2,4 111:2	172:8 179:1,3,8	48:18 49:3,11,18	237:22 240:20	shape 32:13 219:21
168:9 170:2	180:13 184:2,14	50:2,11,16 52:3,5	246:24 247:4,19	222:25 223:9
179:15 184:5	189:10 190:8	53:14 55:17 59:24	252:23	share 193:15,17
190:20 198:8,17	201:15 202:15	60:1,4,15,24	sense 38:23 54:21	241:22,23
198:18,18 207:15	204:1,5 206:2	65:11,15 69:16	54:22 55:12 83:22	shed 228:2
231:15 236:18	210:13,15 211:5	70:2 85:5,7,18,21	97:3,8 150:22	sheet 87:9
238:12 246:5,16	216:10 219:19	86:12 88:21 89:11	155:3 158:12,16	sheets 71:8
scenario 43:23,23	236:10,23 238:4	89:14 91:24 92:6	163:25 190:22	shift 76:24
43:25 52:22	238:11 240:17	92:19 93:17,23	211:25 231:15	shifted 77:13,14
162:16 225:16	244:3 246:15,24	94:6,7 95:4	sensible 51:9	shirk 51:3
schedule 171:7	seeing 167:2	101:16,19 104:5,9	sensitive 246:20	shirked 67:2 85:19
schedules 139:21	183:20,22	104:14 105:9,24	sent 246:11	133:8 176:16
school 3:16 125:9	seeking 24:1	108:14,22,23	sentence 93:13	226:15
127:24 138:7	seen 7:7 13:5 21:12	111:9 112:11	94:3 168:8 170:2	short 178:4
165:4,15	36:25 75:4 87:9	113:18 115:1,12	205:24	shortened 155:5
scientific 67:13	87:17 88:12	115:18,22,25	separate 23:12	shorthand 1:15
scope 23:17 189:9	104:16,22 110:24	116:4,25 117:6,6	111:8 233:5,6,14	256:5
189:13 190:2	115:10,17,20,24	117:8,10,21	serious 116:15	shortly 139:2 152:7
seaboard 3:23	116:3,23 117:3	119:24 120:7	seriously 43:14	show 53:5 87:14
		:	_	·
			·	-

			* 157	
183:6 196:1 236:4	172:12 185:6	slight 20:18	255:18	staple 96:14,18,23
245:20	187:14 191:6,9	slightly 165:18	specific 10:10 11:2	97:4,5,6,7,12,13
showed 7:6 133:21	193:18 200:19	slots 132:6	11:9 27:24 32:5	97:14,15,22,23
209:12 247:25	226:10 230:16	small 72:5 98:12,14	116:22 118:20	98:24 100:16,16
shown 58:10	239:7 248:23	105:9 107:15	120:10 158:22	100:22 225:10,12
204:21	249:3	111:4 153:17	214:14 215:9	225:23,23 226:1,5
shows 195:24 196:2	sincerely 182:20	154:9	246:2	226:21
shut 76:19 239:10	183:1	smaller 97:8	specifically 152:18	stapled 119:13,20
shutdown 125:15	single 156:11	153:17	152:19 171:21	149:19 154:2
shutting 199:17	211:24 212:3	smallest 98:7	178:6 243:19	208:22 209:14,17
side 33:15 51:12,12	231:9	solidly 184:13	specifics 227:19	209:20 210:5
116:13,14 118:1	sir 179:8,19	solution 36:20	specifies 37:8	225:12,13,18
133:5 134:2	sit 8:8 10:1,10,13	somebody 24:20	specify 85:17,25	staples 99:20 231:4
160:16,24 161:21	54:4 62:10 71:11	83:22	109:25 185:9	start 11:16 35:14
161:25 162:6,16	84:3 86:15 91:12	someones 110:1	speculate 10:8,25	36:5 38:20,23
193:24 207:4,5	106:1,9,22 107:3	somewhat 155:6	12:5 30:2 31:20	84:4,5 90:21
219:20 246:23	113:4 125:24	soon 136:8,9	31:25 32:3 39:13	107:1 232:2,7,23
sides 15:13 87:1	136:2 145:21	158:23	100:23 204:14	247:10
89:5 160:22	147:11 171:17	sorry 5:4 10:23	speculation 9:25	started 35:24 73:25
196:10 207:13,23	188:5 195:9 199:5	13:22 51:7 80:9	81:18 181:13	113:22 229:15
signature 6:17 78:3	203:17,17 205:13	145:12 189:4	speculative 216:4	230:18,22 231:7
significant 96:20	sitting 35:3 51:11	251:5 252:6	239:16	starting 95:3,17
236:21 237:3	72:24 99:19 107:8	sort 7:2 125:3	spend 71:6,19	101:8 179:2
signing 256:10	136:3 159:7	132:12 161:4	spent 128:2	200:24 229:22
similar 19:2,7,8	191:20	163:11 167:3	spoken 92:22,25	233:21
20:21,24 64:11	situated 67:20	202:6 212:1 242:8	93:3	state 1:16 193:2
67:4 94:21 123:15	situation 26:4	sorted 155:8	spots 101:1	207:1,1 256:2,6
123:19,20,22	47:10 64:17 84:1	sorts 191:23	spreadsheet 72:16	stated 170:3
161:9,24 176:20	122:16 133:8	sought 91:23	ss 256:3	statement 40:4
176:20,21 194:17	135:20 163:1,5	sounds 149:1	st 1:19 95:6 103:15	121:5,6,22 146:12
239:3	169:8 185:2,14	187:21	103:21 104:1,6	148:2 172:11,17
similarity 75:17	190:17 192:12	source 87:24	105:2,6,14,20,23	173:1 176:8 180:6
similarly 67:20	193:14 194:13	151:23	106:13,24 107:15	187:15 190:16
246:16	239:8,18,22,23	sources 82:15	108:1,3,10,11	206:11,18 208:2,9
simple 138:14	situations 54:23	83:18 126:2 135:8	109:8,10 111:3,12	236:25 248:11
191:7	67:18 103:19,23	137:18 146:5	111:14,15,19,25	250:6
simplest 64:4	155:24 176:20,21	147:3,18 148:10	132:11 199:18	statements 34:5
simply 28:12 33:2	176:21 191:9,10	148:20 172:3	241:13,20,22	46:17 49:24 70:19
35:6 42:12 43:22	191:12 205:3	southwest 79:2	242:5,11 254:16	122:1 124:14
46:15 51:19 54:12	226:12 234:21	speak 15:10 45:4	stack 157:24	178:7 185:13
60:13 61:18,18	six 55:4 191:13	170:22	staff 72:4,11,13,17	187:10 204:21
67:14 85:15,19	size 190:2 209:18	speaking 10:17	142:19	states 1:1 5:6
89:2 90:25 97:12	210:4 240:4	44:23 52:10 196:9	stage 120:23	statistic 62:5 70:24
98:9 113:24	254:19,20 255:7	specialist 5:1,10,25	stand 28:16 42:8	71:1
116:20 120:1	sized 153:1 154:10	6:4 84:16,21,24	51:22 138:18	statistical 212:14
123:15 133:20	skill 157:14	164:19,23 165:1	standard 195:1	status 47:13 78:11
150:14 169:17	slide 242:8	181:19,22 254:5	standing 162:19	95:7,19 101:8,16
Secretary Secretary (Secretary Secretary Secre				

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
101:19 102:1,2,7	244:22	177:14	8:5 9:4 110:6	91:7
102:17 103:8	studied 59:10	sui 66:22	swa 238:8,12	taken 1:14 5:4
111:25 113:18	82:16 91:15	suit 178:1	swear 6:1	32:14 41:6 92:18
114:10 153:10	218:22	suite 2:6	sworn 1:13 6:2	140:18 141:17
157:23 158:22	study 106:7,19	suitors 46:13	256:9	201:19 211:15
159:4,10 211:13	208:2,4	125:12,16 137:19	system 105:10	214:4 215:24
216:20 254:8	stuff 69:6 95:9	summary 3:14 56:9	107:24	256:13
stay 171:14	107:21 248:5	70:24 104:10,14	systematic 150:21	takes 36:20 252:1
stenographic	subject 34:15 43:15	110:24 116:20		talk 9:22 11:4
256:13	50:20 99:12	128:1	T	72:18 216:12
step 159:2	138:22 161:11	supervision 72:15	table 62:3,19,19	220:24 221:2
steps 124:25	sublists 95:8 114:9	supplement 37:3,6	77:21 78:2 132:2	talked 69:25 113:5
sticks 125:22	submit 16:14	37:14 48:6,8	144:4,12 145:5,15	122:1 124:22
stock 221:4,5	submitted 6:12	90:10,15,20 92:20	148:6 152:21,21	137:19 157:16
stood 70:18	7:13 12:20 13:2	100:15,18,24	155:14	talking 47:5 70:12
stop 44:22 52:15	submitting 13:14	101:1 103:14	tainted 133:8	98:19 107:19,19
78:8,16 83:12	subsequent 197:4	104:1,8,15 105:4	215:18 227:2	128:3 199:22
84:17 124:23	subset 88:7 113:25	110:12,20 111:2	229:24 230:5	224:16,18 231:17
125:1 139:11	subsidiary 153:16	127:25 210:15	take 9:16,17,18	tape 84:17,22
152:7 162:22	153:16 233:5,13	223:12 231:20	10:3 22:17 26:17	164:20
168:19,22 169:23	233:14	232:4,14,19	27:11,23 28:16	tasked 71:1
169:24 217:19	substance 81:2	support 206:10,18	31:21 36:19 37:23	technical 197:19
218:11 225:2	substantial 131:1,7	206:19 208:1,9	41:23 42:1,8,14	technique 64:21
235:21	152:8,9 186:5	230:4	51:22 52:6,6 55:3	tell 6:14 10:21 11:1
stoppage 200:8	223:1,9 225:4	supporting 172:17	55:10 56:4 67:17	13:5 16:17 24:15
stopped 230:24	240:17 241:8	173:1,12	78:2 84:18 93:12	24:15,18 33:20
straightforward	substantially 20:24	suppose 48:7 94:3	96:10,12 101:20	40:12 47:13 59:10
9:19,20 51:21,21	56:23,24 57:5,16	196:18 197:5	105:23 106:13	71:9 72:1,8 88:9
123:14	167:11	218:15	109:23 110:25	88:10 99:21
strategic 189:23	succeed 196:16	sure 32:15 41:1	111:24 112:7,14	102:20 106:10,23
strategically	successful 170:4	47:4 52:24 56:1	113:25 114:8	107:1 113:4
189:25	successfully 105:19	73:8 74:10 75:5	116:4 123:4	128:12 132:9
strategies 25:15	234:5	78:10 79:19,20	124:25 126:25	146:18 147:12
56:15	successorship	83:24 94:2 106:19	135:23 138:18	159:6 176:1,10
strategy 24:1 25:9	23:17 189:10,13	113:2,3,10,11	141:24 143:10 152:14 154:18	188:7 194:18
25:11,23,25	sued 223:23	135:14 151:17	155:1 158:23	215:22 216:7
street 1:13	sufficient 105:9	158:4 162:17	169:23 180:15	232:16 247:9
strength 236:11	136:5 138:9	163:25 170:21	191:7 212:17	telling 58:24
strike 15:4,5	144:14 234:17,22	174:1 182:23	213:7,21 215:8	221:10 233:16
162:22 195:2	235:1	185:12 188:5	216:22 217:2	temporal 143:7
207:5,7,7 208:6	suggest 48:23	212:25 213:4 220:4 233:17	210.22 217.2	ten 58:6 67:20 71:15 72:1 84:7
stripped 48:11	90:21 241:3	240:23 241:15	233:23 237:11,20	84:16 126:11
strong 219:14,18	suggested 230:17		238:1 251:23	164:19
struck 156:25 208:3	suggesting 33:14 33:23 36:15 78:1	surprise 73:3 survive 197:6	253:10,18,25	tend 54:17 69:19
structure 94:24	205:3,12	survive 197.6 sustainable 240:22	254:7,12,14,18	161:9 207:18,20
95:3 242:20	suggests 102:4	sustained 7:19,25	takeitorleaveit	207:20 208:5
33.3 4 1 4.40	suggests 102.4	sustaineu 7.17,23		201.20 200.3

211:1 237:22	59:1,15 61:24	theres 20:19 161:4	185:3 192:3	236:5
tended 146:13	63:8,11 64:12	176:23	195:18,19,23	tigers 3:23
tense 209:7	65:7 66:19 70:2	theyre 117:24	197:12 198:21	tight 192:6
tentative 236:19	70:25 74:9,23,23	theyve 36:9	200:21 205:13	time 5:13 7:13
term 21:1 54:9,11	77:3,10 84:9,11	thing 64:8 81:3	206:17 207:2	12:16 13:12 16:9
103:20 197:19	86:16 89:17 91:2	88:23 110:1	210:3 211:24	16:11 50:9 55:13
terms 7:25 8:4 11:2	91:14 96:15 98:6	132:12 166:3,7,14	212:11,19 213:1	64:20 71:6,8,16
62:19 66:3 83:22	98:15 100:22	235:22 242:12	214:3 216:6,9	71:19,22 72:12
101:15 102:23	101:11 104:20	253:18	217:10,25 229:5	75:8,21 78:7 79:9
160:7 167:13	106:12,25 108:14	things 12:5 15:12	232:7,11,12,23	79:12,16 80:13,17
188:2 194:19	108:21,21,22	55:8 67:13 70:17	234:19 235:17	82:5,13 84:14,21
218:3 219:23	109:21 112:6	73:13,17,24 74:20	239:9 241:14	84:24 102:21
221:2 254:20	115:9,23 117:18	81:14,23 88:24	247:8 253:14	112:11 120:19
terrible 128:13	118:14 119:17	108:1 113:20	thinking 55:14	124:10,22 134:6
testament 98:15	120:4 123:16	127:18 128:1	80:10 160:12,14	135:13,24 160:21
testified 6:3 33:5	124:8 125:22	154:19,20,21	252:4	164:23 165:1
80:25 85:2 150:16	132:7,16 133:22	157:14,16,17,19	third 29:1 179:3	168:9,14 170:9
174:18 177:24	137:10 138:1,24	158:4 161:15	200:14 205:24	178:15 181:19,22
191:21 214:1	140:23,24 142:2	183:23 192:16,17	215:11	183:10 184:12,17
216:9 253:10	143:6 145:16,18	201:10 203:14	thought 8:14 9:12	188:17 212:23
testify 182:14	147:19 150:18	225:1 235:20	11:10 12:6 19:9	215:11 222:5
testifying 182:21	154:22,23 157:17	241:6 243:10	40:11 69:5,10,15	232:2 238:21
testimony 3:19	158:3 161:1	252:3	72:19 74:1 83:13	240:4 242:20,23
32:16 45:16 52:9	163:21 169:10,25	think 8:8 9:15,17	127:22,22 169:8	255:18
79:25 80:3,4,15	174:2 175:13,19	9:21 11:4 12:16	170:17 191:21	times 10:7 116:11
81:2,8,11 115:19	175:20 178:3	19:11 35:3 38:20	193:6 198:5	253:14
165:14 177:25	180:18 186:17	51:8 59:3,13	225:18 232:9,9	timing 230:2
178:4,19 179:1	187:19 188:20,22	61:23 62:12 73:18	253:9	231:17 232:12,13
180:16,19,24	192:12,14 194:2	74:9 75:2,6 80:3,7	thoughts 10:2,10	232:17 233:17
182:1,4,6,10	194:10,11,12	80:22 82:9 86:15	10:12 11:7,22	tiny 216:15
183:6,13,18	195:14 196:11,13	90:13 91:7,12	thousand 245:2	toal 2:2 3:4 5:15,15
184:14,16 190:8	196:14 205:9,18	96:8,23 99:18	thousands 20:16	6:5,10 8:13 9:14
190:10 192:25	206:16 208:11	101:22 102:3	threat 163:19	10:11,16,19 11:6
193:10,11 200:22	211:15 215:16,23	103:10,12,13,20	194:19,23 197:9	12:8 13:1,4,25
201:16 203:5,7,9	216:4,9,20 217:22	104:18,22 106:6	197:12,17,18	16:5 17:5 20:12
203:12,13,15,19	219:21 222:9	106:15,16 109:7	threaten 200:7	23:23,24 24:17
203:23 204:3,5,15	223:4,14 224:18	112:24 114:6	threatened 200:10	25:6 26:16,24
204:19 205:8,9,13	226:10,16 228:16	125:15 126:13,24	three 10:6 35:20	27:4,20 28:19
205:18 256:13	228:24 231:12,12	144:6 145:11	36:13 43:3,8,10	29:20 34:17 37:19
texas 153:18,19,23	234:3 235:17	146:21 147:20	53:21 58:10,12	40:17 41:17 43:1
text 209:23	240:7,9 241:25	149:14,20 150:24	71:12 72:2,2,11	44:14,22 45:3,22
thats 10:23 16:13	245:3 248:5,22	152:20,22 158:11	127:1 134:5	46:6 49:9 51:24
16:16,18 18:21	252:6 253:17,17	158:16 165:11	145:17 156:10	52:10,13,17,18
29:19 33:1 36:1	253:21,23 254:17	166:4,16 168:18	170:1 207:7	53:4 66:8 77:5,6
41:12,13 42:7,19	theoretic 194:19	169:6 170:25	220:11 255:19	77:16 81:21 82:3
46:24 49:14 52:10	theoretical 192:7	173:15 175:9,13	thursday 128:5	83:14 84:2,19
53:12 55:11 58:4	theory 9:23	178:6 182:23	tiger 235:12 236:1	85:1 87:13 99:16
			Visit Committee	

104:12 110:2 11	81:8 83:2 84:14	translates 177:6	twa 3:13,16 15:24	169:13,24 170:5,7
104:12 110:3,11 110:19 114:21,23	120:20 124:11	treatment 64:1,3	16:22 23:16,19	170:13,17 171:13
110.19 114.21,23	120.20 124.11	213:2	24:2 26:20 27:14	171:20 172:6,7,19
138:5 140:10,20	131:8,13 135:5	trial 15:8 46:4	29:12 31:5 32:3,7	173:3,16,17,18,20
164:21 165:6	136:6,13,17,20	160:10,13	32:22 33:16 34:8	173:3,10,17,10,20
178:10,13,25	137:8,24 138:12	trials 212:15	34:14,20,23,24	174:11,16 179:13
181:18,24 183:5	137.8,24 138.12	tried 73:4 75:16	37:9 39:8,9,16	179:17 180:22
183:15 186:4	145:8,20 147:2,15	127:25 150:18	40:4,9 41:7,22	181:15 182:22
188:10 193:8	148:9,20 149:5,10	153:13 154:4,7	44:6 46:12,21	183:10 184:21
198:10 199:1,8	149:20,22 150:5,9	156:1 212:17	48:1,11 51:6	185:25 186:23
205:7 218:17	152:9 155:13	trouble 219:18	56:17 59:6 60:15	187:7 188:18
228:25 236:3	156:2,16 157:8	221:1,20	66:13 73:18,24	189:7 190:22
237:8 238:3	158:7 163:3,10	true 36:1 51:1	74:3,11 75:20	195:11,16 197:10
239:20 240:12,13	170:18 171:15	67:22 101:11	76:22 78:14,20,25	197:22,23,25
245:19 248:14	178:15 186:7,16	121:9,11 150:18	79:6,12,16,21	198:15 199:14,16
253:8,20 254:6	187:2,12 188:18	175:1,2,14,20	81:9 84:6,13	199:17 211:8
255:17,20	189:19,21,23	194:10 230:15	85:12,24 89:10,15	213:24 214:9,16
today 5:1 10:2,10	190:7,19 197:24	238:16 250:9	89:22 90:3,6,19	215:7,15,17
10:13 45:4 48:23	199:23,24 200:1,9	253:12 256:12	91:4,9,16,17,23	219:15 220:20
54:4 71:11,25	208:23 214:9	trujillo 1:21	92:4,5 93:16	222:17 223:13,16
84:3 91:13 106:9	216:3 222:13,17	truly 246:22	94:10,14 96:17	223:20 224:1,6
106:22 107:3	223:1,6 224:5,12	trunk 153:8,8	97:9,21 98:7,18	225:2,3,13 226:1
113:4 136:2	225:5 231:21	try 9:3 26:5 43:7	98:18 100:6,10	226:4,17,19 227:5
171:17	235:12,16,20	61:25 97:10	101:5,11,23	227:11,11,25
told 10:7,25 17:18	237:4 240:21	119:23 133:13	103:11,16,21	228:6,22 229:19
17:19 24:10 43:24	241:10 242:17,20	147:7 151:13	104:9,14 105:6,7	230:12,20,23
44:20 52:9 102:10	242:23 243:10	154:10 158:5	105:8 108:3,10,18	231:3,3,11,13,19
102:12,13 188:16	244:9,17 245:6	166:25 216:5	108:25 109:7,10	231:22 232:14
234:1	249:24 250:20,24	234:2 237:24	109:16 110:5,13	233:4,7,10 237:2
tomorrow 255:21	251:21,25 252:16	255:3	110:14 111:3,6,8	237:3 238:16,21
tool 254:11	transactions 65:21	trying 8:3 44:23,25	119:12,20 120:25	239:22 241:9,23
tools 199:20 200:20	66:14 76:4 78:22	82:4,11,20 83:16	121:14 122:23	242:10,17 243:16
top 96:13,18,22	79:3 130:23 131:5	105:23 157:21	123:8 124:6 125:1	243:20,24 244:3,8
97:4,12,13,14,22	139:9 143:2,18	160:23 175:5	126:17 129:16,20	244:14,16,20,23
98:21,23 99:20	144:7,9 145:14	192:11 216:10	129:25 130:4,15	245:1,6 246:6
100:5,6,10,14,16	148:5,15 149:17	220:17 227:20	131:3 132:18,22	247:2,17,24 248:6
100:19,22 101:1	150:11 151:1,12	237:12 239:3	132:22 133:14,14	248:7,17 249:13
101:12,13 153:12	154:11 159:9	242:16	133:21 134:7,14	249:22 250:20,21
156:5,19 158:8	164:8,10,11 174:3	tuck 3:15 125:9	134:23 135:3,8	250:23 251:3,7,10
170:1 246:16	177:16,18 183:11	127:24 135:7	136:7,12,16,21,23	251:12 252:4
tough 193:1 195:11	209:1,1,3 214:2,8	137:18 138:7	137:7,15,23	253:3,12 254:9
195:12,17	234:11 235:10	165:3,15	138:11,19 139:1	twas 34:1,2 46:9
towel 55:1,2	255:4	turn 54:8 68:12	141:6 142:1	74:25 75:7,17,18
transaction 31:10	transcript 3:17,20	171:1 238:7	155:13 158:6,9	79:8 80:12,16,20
31:14 41:20 47:25	128:14,17 178:11	turned 69:17	165:4,16 167:3,16	81:4 82:4,12,21
48:19 66:13 67:9	184:1 188:8,12	turns 108:2,9 153:4	167:16,21,23	83:17,25 120:18
75:8,21 78:14,25	189:1 256:12	201:7 226:19	168:6,9,19,22	121:3,20 122:8,15

				· · · · · ·
122:19 123:5	111:10 112:23	91:22 92:3,10	unmitigated 56:19	225:4 227:17
124:10 129:13	144:8 191:15	95:16 100:17	unnecessary 91:9	235:20 240:17
130:11 131:15	210:12	103:25 104:3,7	unsuccessful 36:9	241:9,17,24 242:2
132:9 167:11	ultimate 95:4	105:14 111:12,14	unusual 152:23	242:16 243:10
203:9,9 227:1,4	ultimately 9:22	111:16 117:19	153:6	244:8,16 245:6,9
228:1 240:3	97:25 154:8	119:10 122:7	unwilling 49:21,24	246:21 247:24
242:19 249:9	169:20 175:2	141:4 184:3 192:9	49:25 50:2,8,8	248:7,8,12 249:7
250:2,15	192:13,16 195:21	195:14 223:15,19	51:10 52:2 186:23	250:7,23 251:19
twice 138:1,1	unable 179:17	224:10 241:11	upper 19:19 21:7	251:24 252:3,9,14
two 10:6 13:19 14:6	184:21 189:7	understands 39:7	21:13,25 22:5	variable 220:8
14:17 15:18 17:10	unattractive	understood 231:8	53:21 54:8 68:4	variation 19:1,6
24:20 25:11,15,25	201:11	undertake 118:2	68:10 213:13	54:20 55:7 67:23
28:23 29:1 35:3	unavailability	132:13 197:8	use 18:13,15 54:19	variety 99:20
43:6 53:9,21	174:14	undertaken 176:22	55:4 56:22,24	207:11
58:14 64:18 68:6	uncomfortable	undertook 118:21	89:3 90:25,25	vast 249:15
68:9 70:4,18	204:11,12	unequal 48:14	96:10 102:22	verbose 69:19
71:12 86:17 93:18	underlying 156:2	unfair 24:11 50:20	110:1 115:20	verdict 3:12 87:7
97:3 102:1 104:17	234:10	193:23 246:23	116:24 117:4	87:11,16,20
107:12 115:2	understand 14:1	uniformly 223:8	142:16 156:21	104:18
116:16,18 126:9	22:24 23:13 26:25	unilateral 35:11	158:20 197:16	verge 121:15,17
126:11 128:9	27:3 28:12 29:15	36:15,22 37:2	209:7 212:8	122:23
134:6 139:16	30:14 32:15 33:11	38:5,8,22 39:3,4	214:19 215:21,22	version 165:12
144:14,19,24	33:13 34:19 37:6	39:21 40:11,15,25	217:22 220:1,7,14	versus 5:5 88:23
145:2 147:1	44:7 49:12 50:23	43:21,21 48:9,14	221:6,7,11 225:10	viability 154:16,16
156:14 157:13	53:20 54:16 55:7	61:16 65:15,19	225:23 228:21	192:17 193:7
160:9 161:23	59:23 66:7,9 74:7	85:4	235:8 254:12	209:9 214:23
162:18 164:24	82:11 83:17 92:2	unilaterally 30:7	useful 69:18 102:6	239:5
168:1,5 172:4	92:9 98:16 100:15	30:21 31:9 33:7	uses 197:19	viable 56:18 240:1
176:2,11,14	103:22 108:21	35:17 36:4 37:14	usually 141:21	vicinage 1:2 5:8
177:18 183:23	119:24 154:7	38:10,15 42:16		video 5:1,10,25 6:4
184:11 195:3,7,24	162:3,13,23,24	44:17 45:11,20	V	84:16,21,24,25
196:1,7 198:16	173:22 189:12	47:9,21,22 48:1	vague 14:11,19	164:19,23 165:1,2
207:5,7,7,13,13	202:24 220:17,18	52:4,23 60:23	216:13	181:19,20,22,23
209:19 216:3	220:21 228:12	61:3 62:16 65:10	valid 122:15,17	254:5 255:18
217:12 222:1,6	231:16 232:12	66:2,11 85:24	valuable 241:13,14	videotaped 5:3
229:17 235:18	238:8 244:10	union 30:16 41:12	242:5,7,10,12	view 21:17 29:7
236:11 243:9	245:14 249:11	65:9 117:24	value 130:11,16,19	35:12,13,13,19
244:19 246:17	253:6	177:11 199:20	131:7,15,19 132:1	36:2 38:24 39:2
254:5	understandably	208:3 226:14,14	132:5,6 145:1,7,8	40:6,10 66:1
twopage 87:9	204:13	unions 17:10 87:1	147:14 148:1,8,19	120:18 121:14
type 139:22	understanding	89:6 117:9 177:18	149:4,9 152:9	122:23 167:3
types 82:14 132:4	24:14 30:5,10,19	208:5 226:12	154:17 157:7	170:12,25 171:6
typical 157:1 169:8	30:24 31:1,7,12	united 1:1 5:6	175:12 176:9	173:5 180:20,25
typo 155:18	33:6,25 34:7	universally 142:9	192:17 193:7	184:19 185:23
F T	35:21 37:13 39:15	universe 151:13	209:9 211:11	194:15 211:10
<u>U</u>	49:2,10,16 64:22	unknown 204:14	214:23 222:11,16	225:2 230:5 232:1
uhhuh 105:3,12	82:25 86:11 90:1	unlimited 16:9	223:7 224:20	232:5 233:22
			EXTO X SHELL	7. 1. 14 5 2 5 7 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4

		<u> </u>	1	
viewed 76:4 231:10	wanted 13:13 45:20	234:3 249:5	win 195:4	64:20 67:21 72:3
views 31:13 49:3,11	54:21 66:18 72:17	250:17 254:23	wind 192:13 195:25	72:5,14 86:8 93:7
82:6 120:7 121:9	113:7,16,19 154:9	ways 14:13 35:3	196:2,14	105:15 119:2
121:11 122:8,18	158:20 248:3,3,3	46:14 86:17 97:3	windfall 246:23	130:2,11 140:8,22
123:5 137:10,11	wants 109:23	weak 134:7 236:18	wisconsin 2:6	146:13,19 147:11
137:12 187:5	181:11 197:24	240:1	withdraw 168:4	161:18 199:10,11
202:4,10 224:6	207:16	weakened 76:14	withdrawn 18:13	199:11 200:7
252:22	washington 2:7	web 73:7 74:14	134:13	201:7,7,11 202:21
violate 61:11	5:19 241:15,21	week 13:11 168:11	witness 3:2 6:1	212:14 218:23
violated 228:15,20	wasnt 18:11 30:2	weiss 2:1 5:15	8:11 9:12 10:9	220:6 233:19
violating 74:5	48:24 61:17	went 70:10 120:4,5	11:1 12:4,6 13:23	242:15
violation 56:16	101:11 138:13	146:25 166:4,5	16:4 20:11 24:13	worked 104:1
virtue 47:2,4	146:7 149:25	171:5 201:1	25:4 26:11 27:3,6	110:6 111:12
voluntarily 32:7	156:22,24 169:8	232:19 234:20	27:18 28:14 29:17	126:25 127:1
vs 1:6	169:14 170:25	weve 46:8 246:18	34:13 37:18 40:3	workers 171:7
	171:2 183:12	wharton 2:1 5:16	41:15 42:24 43:16	working 13:13
W	189:24 192:6,21	whats 8:21 10:22	44:24 45:5,17	68:21 140:15
wait 41:9	way 10:23 24:13	44:7,17 45:12	46:5 49:7 50:22	166:24 233:20
waive 23:17 34:2,8	27:25 28:4 30:25	51:1,14 69:20	52:15,21 66:1	works 109:25
34:14 46:10,19	31:6 33:3 35:6	71:10 75:5 81:20	77:12 81:19 82:1	111:15 198:20
90:23 91:5,9 92:5	36:10 38:17 39:24	94:19 101:14	83:6,21 99:14	199:19
173:25 174:11	40:19 41:2 55:11	103:25 117:19	109:20 110:10,18	world 3:24 30:2
186:23 187:8	60:15 61:1 66:19	126:8 128:16	114:20,22 119:8	44:8 46:9,16 51:2
198:15,15	67:16 69:14,24	160:18 161:6	124:14 138:3	51:2 61:10,11
waived 39:18 40:4	72:8 75:11,25	164:2 175:1,1,14	140:7,14 182:18	66:19 160:2 161:6
41:21 46:20 66:5	77:25 82:6 86:7	181:12 192:11	186:3 192:5	193:2 205:1 227:8
174:6 182:22	86:12,17 96:9	194:15 195:10,11	197:18 199:5	228:22 236:1,5
189:22 256:10	97:11,18,20 98:6	212:12 223:4	204:10,12,16	worry 230:19
waiver 40:7 48:18	99:7,19 108:6,13	227:10 228:5	215:12 218:15	worse 154:20
92:16	109:17 114:3	232:22 245:5	228:11 237:7,18	worth 126:1 132:10
waiving 90:22	116:5,20 118:13	white 4:1 184:10	239:17 247:22	132:11 244:19
walked 187:11	118:19 123:12,13	245:17,22 246:10	253:6,15 256:9,11	wouldnt 9:20 56:24
walsh 170:3	123:13 127:8	whos 195:4	witnesss 45:15	73:2 98:20 109:5
want 11:5 21:1,2	138:2,18 139:6	wide 107:15 113:25	woman 67:19	122:12 123:4,11
25:13 40:11 42:25	141:20 146:25	207:11	women 64:5,6,9,12	149:1 173:6 181:6
44:1,4 46:18	153:16,17 157:17	widebody 102:25	wont 154:12	190:20 204:21
47:12 51:17 52:24	158:2 161:21	105:10 111:4	word 56:24 153:17	217:1,2 219:15,15
64:6 69:22 78:9	162:25 169:15,18	114:1,4	228:18	239:12 240:19
84:18 98:4 99:15	171:18 182:7	wilder 179:4,10,12	wording 221:9	wouldve 25:11
103:12 107:5,9,10	187:13 189:24	willing 50:15,24,25	222:7	137:6
107:13,20 117:13	191:5 192:23	51:15 92:19	words 70:25 97:22	wound 32:9 51:5
137:14 146:6,6,6	202:2 203:6,11,21	130:21,24 166:18	150:12,12 152:25	153:12 154:1
146:12 162:17,19	203:25 204:18	189:21 230:12	176:15 202:16	158:2
164:3 195:18	205:2 206:2	252:22	213:10,17 233:1	wow 174:17
197:15 206:16	207:21 215:24	willingness 31:13	work 6:24 7:8,15	written 96:1
213:9 225:6,22,23	227:22,23,24	182:2 202:5,10	9:24 15:3,6 17:25	151:25 159:23
225:24	230:6 231:18	203:1	18:1,4,17,22	wrong 10:22
			care verescommunes comarcom	

		<u> </u>	1	1
112:25 122:3	0	255:18,22	326 53:18 54:14	8
153:16 156:23	000 127:3,5,8 186:1	2001 3:25 24:1	35 164:23	821:3 221:4,6
174:19 196:19	212:6,19,22 220:9	104:15 107:9	37 165:1 240:10,12	808 56:18
228:18	220:9	139:2 214:10,16	3733869 2:4	856 1:23
	01 181:19	214:16 215:6,7	39 112:22 165:21	8626800 1:19
X	022917 1:2 5:8	232:20 233:1	166:2	87 3:12
xio1556 256:22	04 53:25	245:16,21		887 56:17,22 58:20
xpost 182:21 185:1	08033 1:22	20016 2:7	4	58:25
190:15	08540 1:14	2002 232:19 233:1	409 56:17	889 166:19
		233:6	41 142:19 144:9	
Y	11	2011 126:16	145:14 150:11	9
yeah 63:20 73:15	1 53:18,25 54:14	2012 7:14 107:11	151:1,12	9 1:16 5:13
79:23 108:9 113:7	164:15,23 170:5,5	126:15	42 181:22	95 55:13
118:10 119:14,22	210:6	2013 1:11 5:2	43 1:16 5:13 84:25	
121:18 143:12	10 22:15 210:7	256:24	45 178:18,20 179:2	
144:1 145:13	10019 2:3	202 2:7	210:4	
147:3 155:4	104 3:13	2044912 256:23	4530 2:6	
164:15,16 165:12	11 84:22,25 142:21	21 37:23 143:13	464 226:21	
166:3,9 174:18	143:22 186:1	150:4	47 180:12	
176:7 178:21	210:24 246:15	212 2:4	48 56:8 58:19	
189:3 196:25	12 221:5	22 1:11 6:18	5	
199:9 202:9	1285 2:3	225 201:22	5 255:18,22	
221:13 233:15	12th 7:14	22nd 5:2	1	
year 71:21 126:14	13 3:9 256:23	23 256:24	50 22:4 500 68:5,10	
221:4 233:3	14 104:15 112:7	2300 244:13,21		
years 84:8 126:9,12	146 236:10	245:1	52 3:10	
yesterday 80:25	147 238:7	234 3:22	6	
yield 22:8 97:8 191:23	15 210:4	24 171:25 205:20	63:4,8 21:3 139:13	
	150 168:10	244 3:25	212:6 221:4	
yielded 97:21 156:19	16 184:2	25 142:17 143:21	256:23	
	164 3:15	183:25 184:2	627 155:18	
yields 98:7	17 200:24	189:1,2,5	63105 1:19	
york 2:3,3 youd 158:24	177 3:17	250 2:6	647 56:18,22 57:4	
youll 62:3	179 56:17	258 1:22	58:22,24	
youn 62.3 younger 71:17	18 3:25 245:16,21	26 104:25 151:21	6594656 2:7	
younger /1.17 youre 8:7 10:8,16	182 3:19	200:24		
122:3 216:5	187 3:20	27 110:25 210:7	7	
242:13	19 144:6,10 165:24	28 84:22	721:3 178:23	
youve 13:5 87:17	256:23	29 142:20	700 1:14	
115:20 116:23	1970s 238:14	3	701 56:18	
165:10 174:18	1981 238:5	3 22:17 181:19,22	73 56:16 58:7,15,21	
177:25 198:16	1993 105:9	212:19,22 220:9,9	58:24	
204:21 215:11	1999 201:23	30 112:9 179:6	7333 1:18	
245:24	2	212:8	747 101:12	
<u>БТ</u> Ј.БТ	2 165:1 201:22	314 1:19	747s 101:11	
Z		32 1:13 210:23	7959002 1:23	
	20 127:3,5,8 168:9	3 <u>4</u> 1.13 410.43		
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	LLCC C V West Commence and a second s	04/06/2 4/06/24/04/0 5/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/04/		